NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

Congressional Information Service, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

CIS

Calendar No. 248

98TH CONGRESS
1st Session
SENATE
REPORT
No. 98-153

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1984

JUNE 16 (legislative day, JUNE 13), 1983.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 3132]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 3132) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

AMOUNT IN NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, FISCAL YEAR 1984

Amount of bill as passed by the House	$14,180,003,000
Budget estimates considered by House	14,610,671,000
Budget estimates considered by Senate	14,610,671,000
Amount of bill as reported to the Senate	14,170,853,000
Amount of appropriations, 1983	14,535,691,000
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the appropriations, 1983	−364,838,000
Under the budget estimate, 1984	−439,818,000
Under the House-passed bill	−9,150,000

S183-8

INDEX TO REPORT

TITLE I

Department of Defense—Civil: Department of the Army:
Corps of Engineers—Civil:

Page
Construction, general 28
Flood control and coastal emergencies 72
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries 45
General expenses 73
General investigations 7
Operation and maintenance, general 52
Revolving fund 72
Special recreation use fees 73

TITLE II

Department of the Interior:
Bureau of Reclamation:

Construction program 81
General administrative expenses 96
General investigations 74
Loan program 92
Operation and maintenance 92

TITLE III

Department of Energy:

Atomic energy defense activities 157
Departmental administration 186
Energy supply, research and development activities 97
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 199
General science and research activities 150
Geothermal Resources Development Fund 204
Nuclear waste disposal fund 156

Power marketing administrations:

Alaska Power Administration 195
Bonneville Power Administration 196
Southeastern Power Administration 197
Southwestern Power Administration 197
Western Area Power Administration 198
Uranium supply and enrichment activities 140

TITLE IV

Independent Agencies:

Appalachian Regional Commission 205
Delaware River Basin Commission 207
Funds Appropriated to the President 205
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin 208
Nuclear Regulatory Commission 209
Susquehanna River Basin Commission 208
Tennessee Valley Authority 209

INTRODUCTION

As stated in previous years, energy and water are the fundamental, inseparable subjects of this appropriation bill. Simply stated these resources are the Nation's lifeblood. Only with secure supplies and careful management of these, our most precious resources, can our Nation be assured of a secure, stable, and prosperous future. And, the wise use, development and management of these resources for current needs and thoughtful conservation for future needs are essential.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide appropriations for the fiscal year 1984 beginning October 1, 1983 and ending September 30, 1984 for energy and water development, and for other related purposes. It supplies funds for water resources development programs and related activities of the Department of the Army, Civil Functions—U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Civil Works program in title I; for the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation in title II; for the Department of Energy (except for fossil fuel programs, and certain conservation and regulatory programs) in title III; and for related independent agencies and commissions, including the Appalachian Regional Commission and Appalachian Regional Development Programs, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the Tennessee Valley Authority in title IV.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The President's fiscal year 1984 budget estimates for this bill totals $14,610,671,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The recommendation of the Committee totals $14,170,853,000. This is a decrease of $439,818,000 below the budget estimates and $9,150,000 below the House bill.

BILL HIGHLIGHTS

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The amount recommended in the bill includes $6,500,875,000 for atomic energy defense activities. Major programs and activities include:

Testing	$546,100,000
Research and development	823,580,000
Weapons activities	3,730,825,000
Nuclear materials production	1,525,400,000
Defense waste management	608,500,000

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill recommended by the Committee provides a total of $1,943,709,000 for energy supply, research, development and demonstration programs including:

Solar energy	$176,000,000
Geothermal energy	29,459,000
Hydropower	750,000
Nuclear fission	617,147,000
Magnetic fusion	471,500,000
Environmental	222,575,000
Basic energy sciences	337,270,000

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommendation also provides $635,250,000 for general science and research activities in life sciences, high energy physics and nuclear physics including:

High energy physics research	$490,000,000
Nuclear physics	153,000,000

REGULATORY AND OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Also recommended in the bill is $670,678,000 for various regulatory and independent agencies of the Federal Government. Major programs and activities include:

Appalachian regional development programs	$125,000,000
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	94,582,000
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	466,800,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	75,229,000

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

The Committee has also recommended appropriations totaling approximately $3,583,784,000 for Federal water resource development programs. This includes projects and related activities of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Federal water resource development program provides lasting benefits to the Nation in the areas of flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, irrigation of agricultural lands, water conservation, commercial navigation, hydroelectric power, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Major programs related to water resources development include:

Corps of Engineers—Civil:	
General investigations	$121,435,000
Construction activities	1,111,629,000
Operations and maintenance activities	1,265,965,000
Bureau of Reclamation:	
General investigations	31,981,000
Construction activities	724,318,000
Operations and maintenance activities	134,291,000
Tennessee Valley Authority:	
Construction activities	24,015,000
Operating expenses	22,410,000

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Both this Committee and the House Committee have stated on numerous occasions that water is this Nation's most precious and valuable resource, the basic need of all life. Therefore, it is clear that the adequate supply of water is as important, if not more important, than energy.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS TO THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The Commttee believes that it is important to point out that the overwhelming percentage of Federal funds for public works projects in the bill is expended in the private sector. For example, the turbines, steel, cement, and other materials used to build these projects are manufactured and marketed by private industry. The actual construction of the projects is contracted to private industry through Government contracts.

NEW CONSTRUCTION START POLICY

In formulating the bill, the Committee has chosen not to begin construction on new projects in fiscal year 1984. The Committee is aware that several meritorious projects are either authorized or awaiting to be authorized. Each of these projects is urgently needed to address critical needs. Further, the Committee has received numerous requests to undertake new projects and rehabilitation of existing projects.

The Committee's decision is for the bill only and is with the understanding and assurance that a number of critical projects, now awaiting appropriations to begin construction, will be given every consideration by the Committee at the earliest opportunity.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development of the Committee on Appropriations held 21 sessions of hearings (15 different days) in connection with the fiscal year 1984 appropriation bill. One closed hearing session was held on classified matters in this bill. Witnesses included officials and representatives of the Federal agencies; numerous Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, Governors, State and local government officials and representatives; and hundreds of citizens of all walks of life from throughout the United States. Testimony, both for and against many items, was presented to the subcommittee.

HOUSE GENERAL REDUCTION

The House-passed bill includes a provision which requires that 3 percent of each appropriation in the bill be withheld from obligation and expenditure. The House-passed bill is $430,668,000 less than the budget estimates considered by the House, including the $235,720,000 across-the-board general reduction. The House also included a general provision in the bill to carry out the intent to apply the general reduction to every program, subprogram, project, and activity reflected in the House report, as explained in that report. This Committee disagrees with the House 3-percent general reduction and has stricken the provision from the bill.

The House Committee report does not reflect this general reduction on every program, subprogram, project, and activity within each appropriation account. And, in order to avoid much confusion and to facilitate matters, the Committee has not applied this reduction to the hundreds of items under the various appropriation accounts shown in this report as House-approved amounts. Therefore, each House amount shown, other than at the appropriation account level, should be reduced by 3 percent to determine the actual House-approved allowance.

VOTES IN THE COMMITTEE

The subcommittee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present, on June 14, 1983, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported to the full Committee on Appropriations.

The Committee, by unanimous vote of a quorum present on June 16, 1983, recommended that the bill, as amended, be reported.

COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 7, RULE XVI, STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

The following items of appropriations recommended by the Committee, not made to carry out the provisions of existing law or an act passed by the Senate in this session, are brought to the attention of the Senate in accordance with rule XVI, paragraph 7.

Page 10, under general investigations, an amendment is included providing appropriations for the Twin Falls Canal Co., for which there is no authorization.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1983	$129,042,000
Budget estimate, 1984	110,400,000
House allowance	148,733,000
Committee recommendation	118,435,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+8,035,000
House allowance	−30,298,000

An appropriation of $118,435,000 is recommended by the Committee, which is $30,298,000 below the House allowance and $8,035,000 above the budget request.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and planning activities are shown in the following table, with Committee comments following immediately after the tabulation.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	ALABAMA								
(N)	ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER BELOW CLAIBORNE L&D..............	2,002,000	390,000	459,000	---	459,000	---	459,000	---
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE..	288,000	---	---	---	80,000	---	---	---
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR DEEPENING (CP&E)........................	4,850,000	1,656,000	700,000	---	900,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	THREE MILE CREEK (CP&E)...............................	900,000	---	---	---	600,000	---	---	---
(N)	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK AND DAM (CP&E)..............	4,100,000	---	---	---	1,300,000	---	600,000	---
	ALASKA								
(BE)	BETHEL BANK STABILIZATION (CP&E)......................	550,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	RIVERS AND HARBORS....................................	8,970,000	1,851,000	300,000	---	400,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SMALL HYDROPOWER......................................	4,670,000	3,035,000	800,000	---	800,000	---	800,000	---
(N)	SOUTHCENTRAL DEEP-DRAFT NAVIGATION....................	1,958,000	1,081,000	200,000	---	300,000	---	200,000	---
	ARIZONA								
(FC)	HOLBROOK, LITTLE COLORADO RIVER (CP&E)................	680,000	120,000	---	---	335,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, NOGALES WASH, AZ & NM.......	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	GILA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, AZ & NM...................	4,160,000	2,845,000	530,000	---	730,000	---	530,000	---
	ARKANSAS								
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN, AR & OK.........................	310,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER VICINITY OF FT SMITH - VAN BUREN.......	1,270,000	1,128,000	142,000	---	142,000	---	142,000	---
(N)	ARKANSAS RIVER & TRIBS HYDROPOWER & OTHER PURPOSES, AR & OK..	2,690,000	2,268,000	422,000	---	422,000	---	422,000	---
(FDP)	CLARKSVILLE...	950,000	283,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(COMP)	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION COMPRENSIVE STUDY.............	800,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FC)	FOURCHE BAYOU IN THE VICINITY OF LITTLE ROCK (CP&E)...	2,000,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FC)	MCKINNEY BAYOU, AR & TX	5,610,000	864,000	---	270,000	---	270,000	---	270,000
(FDP)	NORTH LITTLE ROCK (DARK HOLLOW)	500,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, AR & LA	7,760,000	5,945,000	696,000	---	696,000	---	696,000	---
(FC)	RED RIVER WW, INDEX, AR TO DENISON DAM, TX	183,000,000	105,000	---	---	---	350,000	---	---
(COMP)	RED RIVER BASIN, AR, TX, LA & OK	1,200,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(COMP)	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM, AR, LA, OK & TX (AUTH RPTS)	1,770,000	992,000	460,000	---	460,000	---	460,000	---
(N)	WHITE RIVER NAVIGATION TO BATESVILLE (CP&E)	900,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, SHREVEPORT LA TO VICINITY INDEX AR	200,000,000	718,000	---	---	---	490,000	---	490,000
	CALIFORNIA								
(FDP)	ALAMEDA CREEK, UPPER BASIN	1,365,000	1,190,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
(FDP)	ANTELOPE VALLEY	985,000	545,000	---	---	340,000	---	---	---
(FC)	CACHE CREEK (CP&E)	1,500,000	70,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	CALIENTE CREEK INTERIM	1,500,000	907,000	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FDP)	CALLEGUAS CREEK	1,770,000	1,015,000	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SPEC)	COAST OF CALIF, STORM AND TIDAL WAVES	7,390,000	995,000	750,000	---	1,500,000	---	750,000	---
(FC)	COTTONWOOD CREEK	750,000,000	11,875,000	---	4,000,000	---	4,000,000	---	4,000,000
(FDP)	DRY CREEK INTERIM	300,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FC)	GOLETA AND VICINITY	45,200,000	890,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FDP)	GUADALUPE RIVER	1,961,000	1,791,000	170,000	---	360,000	---	170,000	---
(FDP)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA REVIEW	3,665,000	2,293,000	820,000	---	820,000	---	820,000	---
(N)	LOS ANGELES AND LONG BEACH HARBORS (INCL SAN PEDRO BAY MODEL)	6,612,000	6,356,000	256,000	---	256,000	---	256,000	---
(FC)	MORRISON CREEK STREAM GROUP (PHASE I)	3,000,000	1,500,000	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (CHANNEL EXTENSION)	1,830,000	359,000	---	91,000	---	91,000	---	91,000
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (BREAKWATER)	6,240,000	589,000	---	184,000	---	184,000	---	184,000
(SP)	POINT MUGU TO SAN PEDRO BREAKWATER	1,250,000	124,000	---	---	300,000	---	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(N)	OAKLAND INNER HARBOR, (CP&E)............................	540,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEKS (CP&E)......................	3,800,000	670,000	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
(N)	REDONDO BEACH HARBOR (KING HARBOR).....................	183,000	39,000	---	---	85,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS (BANK PROT & EROS CONTROL)...	2,500,000	2,361,006	139,000	---	139,000	---	139,000	---
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL (CP&E)........	3,500,000	825,000	---	---	1,700,000	---	800,000	---
(FDP)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY SHORELINE............................	3,555,000	1,135,000	600,000	---	700,000	---	600,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN................................	7,800,000	5,028,000	---	---	500,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY.................................	945,000	405,000	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SANTA ANA RIVER & ORANGE COUNTY........................	8,300,000	6,567,000	122,000	---	475,000	---	122,000	---
(FDP)	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY STREAMS...........................	1,376,000	809,000	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER (CP&E).................................	18,600,000	3,315,000	2,300,000	---	2,900,000	---	2,300,000	---
(N)	SUNSET HARBOR..	820,000	620,000	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	WALNUT CREEK BASIN.....................................	674,000	574,000	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
	COLORADO								
(FC)	ARK R & TRIBS ABOVE J.M. DAM, FOUNTAIN CREEK AT PUEBLO (CP&E)..	1,450,000	1,150,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	ARK R & TRIBS ABOVE JOHN MARTIN DAM (PHASE I)..........	4,370,000	2,599,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(FDP)	FOUNTAIN CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NORTH OF PUEBLO.......	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	WESTERLY CREEK (CP&E)..................................	450,000	---	---	---	210,000	---	---	---
	CONNECTICUT								
(COMP)	LONG ISLAND SOUND - THAMESVILLE TIDAL FLOOD MANAGEMENT...	420,000	85,000	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---
(SPEC)	LONG ISLAND SOUND - DREDGED MATERIAL CONTAINMENT STUDY..	1,840,000	1,474,000	325,000	---	325,000	---	325,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	FLORIDA								
(N)	BISCAYNE BAY	2,412,000	80,000	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(SPEC)	BREVARD COUNTY	220,000	---	---	---	120,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA WATER SUPPLY	2,192,000	1,792,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	CHARLOTTE HARBOR (BOCA GRANDE)	439,000	51,000	125,000	---	---	---	125,000	---
(N)	CLEARWATER SPOIL DISPOSAL	335,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	ESCAMBIA RIVER	460,000	---	---	---	110,000	---	---	---
(BE)	INDIAN RIVER COUNTY (CP&E)	220,000	---	---	---	130,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	GOLDEN GATES ESTATES	1,289,000	662,000	---	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	GULF COAST PASSES (CP&E)	200,000	---	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	KISSIMMEE RIVER	2,490,000	2,283,000	207,000	---	207,000	---	207,000	---
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR (MILLCOVE) (CP&E)	260,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(SP)	MARTIN COUNTY	371,000	295,000	76,000	---	76,000	---	76,000	---
(N)	MEXICO BEACH INLET	250,000	---	---	---	90,000	---	---	---
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL	337,000	225,000	112,000	---	112,000	---	112,000	---
(SP)	MONROE COUNTY	1,503,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR	177,000	98,000	79,000	---	79,000	---	79,000	---
(BE)	PANAMA CITY BEACHES (CP&E)	2,750,000	---	---	---	1,000,000	---	---	---
(N)	PORT SUTTON CHANNEL	280,000	50,000	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SIX MILE CYPRESS SLOUGH	403,000	109,000	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	ST. MARY'S RIVER BASIN	2,000,000	---	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR BRANCH CHANNELS	47,000,000	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	ST. JOHNS RIVER	2,500,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SUWANEE RIVER	1,648,000	430,000	---	---	280,000	---	---	---
	GEORGIA								
(FC)	BRUNSWICK	1,420,000	425,000	---	---	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	DALTON LAKE (PHASE I)	2,275,000	496,000	190,000	---	190,000	---	190,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FC)	LAKE LANIER REREGULATION, GA - METRO ATLANTA W.S.(CP&E)	1,900,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHEAST GEORGIA REGION	1,360,000	365,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN AT OATES CREEK (CP&E)	695,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR COMPREHENSIVE	1,609,000	1,441,000	168,000	---	168,000	---	168,000	---
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR WIDENING (CP&E)	800,000	375,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	425,000	---
(COMP)	SOUTH METRO ATLANTA	300,000	150,000	---	---	---	---	150,000	---
	GUAM								
(FC)	AGANA RIVER (CP&E)	420,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN THE TERRITORY OF GUAM	3,200,000	2,796,000	96,000	---	96,000	---	96,000	---
	HAWAII								
(FDP)	HARBORS & RIVERS IN HAWAII, SOUTH KOHALA WATER SUPPLY.	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	HARB[illegible] & RIVERS IN HAWAII	3,709,000	2,967,000	317,000	---	317,000	---	317,000	---
	IDAHO								
(FDP)	COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ID, MT, OR & WA	22,669,000	12,892,000	1,095,000	---	1,800,000	---	1,095,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER SNAKE RIVER AND TRIB., ID & WY	5,613,000	4,056,000	550,000	---	550,000	---	550,000	---
	ILLINOIS								
(FDP)	CHICAGO - SOUTH END OF LAKE MICHIGAN, IL & IN	4,403,000	3,381,000	140,000	---	140,000	---	140,000	---
(MP)	CHICAGOLAND UNDERFLOW PLAN (PHASE I)	9,052,000	7,427,000	865,000	---	865,000	---	865,000	---
(FDP)	FOX RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, IL & WI	2,328,000	2,137,000	191,000	---	191,000	---	191,000	---
(FC)	HILLVIEW D&D	11,500,000	931,000	---	284,000	---	284,000	---	284,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FC)	LOVES PARK (CP&E)	1,425,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(SP)	ILLINOIS SHORE OF LAKE MICHIGAN	1,516,000	279,000	---	---	85,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	MACKINAW RIVER	869,000	55,000	---	---	50,000	---	---	---
(FC)	MEREDOSIA LAKE AND WILLOW CREEK D&L DIST	9,300,000	590,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
(FC)	MEREDOSIA, ILLINOIS AND MEREDOSIA WILLOW CREEK & COON RUN D&LD	11,200,000	732,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
(FDP)	MISS RIVER, COON RAPIDS DAM TO OHIO RIV, IL, IA, MN, MO & WI	8,411,000	4,754,000	1,484,000	---	1,484,000	---	1,484,000	---
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH OF CHICAGO RIVER (PHASE I) (CP&E)	780,000	450,000	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	OHIO RIVER MAIN STEM, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV	10,450,000	2,849,000	1,345,000	---	2,030,000	---	1,745,000	---
(FDP)	RICHLAND CREEK	1,015,000	809,000	116,000	---	116,000	---	116,000	---
(FC)	ROCK RIVER AGRICULTURAL LEVEES	33,100,000	698,000	---	160,000	---	160,000	---	160,000
(FC)	VERMILLION RIVER BASIN	---	---	---	---	75,000	---	---	---
(SP)	INDIANA								
(FDP)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
(BE)	INDIANA SHORELINE EROSION, LAKE MICHIGAN (CP&E)	200,000	185,000	---	---	150,000	---	---	---
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER (CP&E)	1,200,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN (CADY MARSH DITCH)	155,000	120,000	35,000	---	35,000	---	35,000	---
(COMP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE (AUTHORIZATION REPORTS), IN & IL	2,642,000	1,672,000	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
	IOWA								
(FC)	PERRY CREEK (CP&E)	370,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	KANSAS								
(FDP)	ARK RIV & TRIBS GREAT BEND KS TO TULSA OK REMAINING, KS & OK	7,260,000	4,392,000	253,000	---	253,000	---	253,000	---
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER FROM GREAT BEND TO JOHN MARTIN DAM, KS & CO	2,933,000	2,493,000	190,000	---	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FC)	DOUGLASS LAKE	51,400,000	---	---	---	---	200,000	---	---
(FC)	GREAT BEND LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT	39,400,000	884,000	---	---	---	300,000	---	300,000
(FDP)	KANSAS AND OSAGE RIVERS	5,310,000	4,742,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	VERDIGRIS RIV, KS & OK	3,500,000	3,075,000	410,000	---	410,000	---	410,000	---
(FDP)	VERDIGRIS RIVER, KS & OK (CANEY RIVER)	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	KENTUCKY								
(N)	BIG SANDY RIVER, KY, WV & VA	3,392,000	2,342,000	600,000	---	600,000	---	600,000	---
(N)	CUMBERLAND-TENNESSEE RIVERS, KY, AL, GA, MS, NC, TN & VA	5,885,000	1,487,000	300,000	---	700,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	FRANKFORT (SOUTH FRANKFORT)	5,200,000	262,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY & TN	1,546,000	958,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	2,282,000	1,472,000	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY & TN	3,504,000	1,239,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	LOUISIANA								
(FDP)	ALOHA-RIGOLETTE AREA	830,000	655,000	175,000	---	175,000	---	175,000	---
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN (NORTH SHORE) (CP&E)	850,000	---	---	---	75,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN (WEST SHORE)	967,000	30,000	---	---	120,000	---	---	---
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX	4,065,000	2,043,000	---	---	200,000	---	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL AREA - LAND LOSS AND MARSH CREATION.	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL SHORE & BARRIER ISLAND EROSION......	515,000	---	---	---	290,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	LOUISIANA COASTAL WATER SUPPLY........................	650,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	MERMENTAU, VERMILION, & CALCASIEU RVS & BAYOU TECHE...	5,690,000	1,392,000	460,000	---	620,000	---	460,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET (ENLARGEMENT) (CP&E)..	7,600,000	3,545,000	600,000	---	1,200,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	SLIDELL..	---	---	---	---	---	700,000	---	---
	MAINE								
(N)	FORE RIVER CHANNEL PORTLAND HARBOR....................	430,000	252,000	115,000	---	115,000	---	115,000	---
(FDP)	SAINT JOHN RIVER......................................	3,670,000	1,398,000	380,000	---	380,000	---	380,000	---
	MARYLAND								
(SPEC)	CHESAPEAKE BAY STUDY, MD & VA.........................	32,171,000	31,271,000	900,000	---	900,000	---	900,000	---
	MASSACHUSETTS								
(N)	EAST BOAT BASIN, SANDWICH.............................	375,000	350,000	25,000	---	25,000	---	25,000	---
(FC)	QUINCY COASTAL STREAMS, TOWN BROOK (CP&E).............	600,000	300,000	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
(COMP)	SOUTHEASTERN NEW ENGLAND AUTH REPORTS, MA, RI & CT....	1,666,000	1,396,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	MICHIGAN								
(FDP)	GREAT LAKES, PARTICULARLY LAKE ONTARIO & LAKE ERIE....	9,844,000	8,535,000	380,000	---	380,000	---	380,000	---
(N)	GREAT LAKES CONNECTING C&H, MI, IL, IN, MN, NY, OH, PA & WI..	6,650,000	4,474,000	1,250,000	---	1,250,000	---	1,250,000	---
(FDP)	SAGINAW RIVER BASIN...................................	3,485,000	542,000	260,000	---	260,000	---	260,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	MINNESOTA								
(FC)	CHASKA	17,600,000	1,159,000	—	300,000	—	300,000	—	300,000
(FC)	EAST GRAND FORKS	12,300,000	658,000	—	200,000	—	200,000	—	200,000
(FDP)	MINNESOTA RIVER VALLEY	9,335,000	3,623,000	—	—	650,000	—	—	—
(FC)	REDWOOD RIVER AT MARSHALL (CP&E)	290,000	—	150,000	—	150,000	—	150,000	—
(FDP)	SAINT CROIX RIVER, MN & WI	990,000	297,000	350,000	—	350,000	—	350,000	—
	MISSISSIPPI								
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI GULF COAST AREA	1,974,000	—	—	—	—	—	300,000	—
(SPEC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, EAST BANK NATCHEZ AREA	—	—	—	—	—	—	150,000	—
(N)	MISSISSIPPI SOUND AND ADJACENT AREAS, MS & AL	2,087,000	2,011,000	76,000	—	76,000	—	76,000	—
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR	1,186,000	933,000	253,000	—	253,000	—	253,000	—
(FDP)	PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN, MS & AL	2,135,000	1,526,000	305,000	—	305,000	—	305,000	—
(FDP)	PEARL RIVER BASIN, MS & LA	7,180,000	3,896,000	900,000	—	1,200,000	—	1,200,000	—
(SPEC)	TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY SPECIAL STUDY, MS, AL, TN & KY	6,007,000	5,292,000	628,000	—	628,000	—	628,000	—
(N)	WOLF AND JORDAN RIVERS	166,000	125,000	41,000	—	41,000	—	41,000	—
(N)	YAZOO RIVER	213,611,000	1,955,000	—	100,000	—	100,000	—	100,000
	MISSOURI								
(FC)	HANNIBAL	6,811,000	311,000	—	150,000	—	150,000	—	150,000
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN (FLOOD CONTROL)	1,600,000	600,000	—	—	—	800,000	—	800,000
(SPEC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN (WATER SUPPLY)	600,000	—	—	—	600,000	—	—	—
(FDP)	OSAGE RIVER	400,000	—	—	—	200,000	—	—	—
(FDP)	ST LOUIS METROPOLITAN AREA, MO & IL	11,130,000	7,265,000	1,490,000	—	1,490,000	—	1,490,000	—
(FDP)	STE GENEVIEVE	820,000	720,000	100,000	—	100,000	—	100,000	—

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(FC)	WEARS CREEK, JEFFERSON CITY (PHASE I)	250,000	50,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	WHITE RIVER BASIN COUNTY LINE LAKE	1,000,000	680,000	250,000	---	250,000	---	250,000	---
	MONTANA								
(FDP)	MILK RIVER, HAVRE	110,000	---	---	---	105,000	---	---	---
	NEVADA								
(FDP)	TRUCKEE MEADOWS	1,650,000	1,550,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH & TRIBUTARIES	450,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	VIRGIN RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, MOAPA VALLEY	400,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---	---
	NEW HAMPSHIRE								
(N)	PORTSMOUTH HARBOR & PISCATAGUA RIVER, NH & ME (CP&E)	600,000	300,000	---	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	WINNIPESAUKEE RIVER	700,000	613,000	87,000	---	87,000	---	87,000	---
	NEW JERSEY								
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER IN THE VICINITY OF CAMDEN	5,750,000	170,000	---	50,000	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA & DE	5,000,000	713,000	950,000	---	950,000	---	950,000	---
(FC)	PASSAIC RIVER BASIN STUDY, NJ & NY (PHASE I)	15,878,000	11,986,000	1,535,000	---	1,535,000	---	1,535,000	---
(FC)	RAHWAY RIVER, ROBINSON'S BRANCH, CITY OF RAHWAY (CP&E)	650,000	300,000	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FC)	RAHWAY RIV BASIN, RAHWAY & VAN WINKLES BR-SPRINGFIELD (CP&E)	900,000	535,000	340,000	---	340,000	---	340,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	NEW MEXICO								
(FC)	ALBUQUERQUE NORTH DIVERSION CHANNEL STUDY	700,000	—	—	—	—	—	300,000	—
(FC)	RIO GRANDE & TRIBUTARIES (MIDDEL RIO GRANDE TO BELEN),	2,300,000	—	—	—	—	—	500,000	—
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM & CO	7,700,000	4,908,000	150,000	—	150,000	—	150,000	—
(FC)	SANTA FE RIVER AND ARROYO MASCARAS	5,130,000	829,000	—	156,000	—	156,000	—	156,000
	NEW YORK								
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHANNEL, HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TERMINAL	667,000	469,000	155,000	—	155,000	—	155,000	—
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR	2,000,000	1,465,000	335,000	—	335,000	—	335,000	—
(FDP)	DELAWARE RIVER BASIN, NY, PA & NJ (ICE JAMS)	100,000	—	100,000	—	100,000	—	100,000	—
(N)	GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, BROOKLYN (CP&E)	250,000	—	—	—	150,000	—	—	—
(N)	KILL VAN KULL & NEWARK BAY CHANNELS, NY & NJ (CP&E)	2,650,000	—	—	—	1,500,000	—	600,000	—
(N)	JONES INLET AND FREEPORT LONG ISLAND	584,000	541,000	43,000	—	43,000	—	43,000	—
(FC)	MAMARONECK AND SHELDRAKE RIVERS, VILLAGE OF MAMARONECK (CP&E)	3,340,000	555,000	250,000	—	250,000	—	250,000	—
(N)	MORICHES INLET	2,181,000	931,000	—	—	—	100,000	—	—
(N)	NY HARBOR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, NY & NJ	6,700,000	2,210,000	1,300,000	—	2,300,000	—	1,300,000	—
(FDP)	OSWEGO RIVER WATERSHED	3,504,000	3,329,000	175,000	—	175,000	—	175,000	—
(N)	SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY, ADDITIONAL LOCKS	3,745,000	2,789,000	200,000	—	200,000	—	200,000	—
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET	10,420,000	—	—	—	—	250,000	—	—
	NORTH CAROLINA								
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ACME TO FAYETTEVILLE	821,000	420,000	110,000	—	110,000	—	110,000	—
(FDP)	NEUSE RIVER	2,025,000	912,000	325,000	—	325,000	—	325,000	—
(FDP)	ROANOKE RIVER SOUTH BOSTON AND VICINITY, NC & VA	2,523,009	1,523,000	340,000	—	340,000	—	340,000	—
(SP)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET	786,000	412,000	—	—	200,000	—	—	—

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	NORTH DAKOTA								
(FDP)	RED RIVER OF THE NORTH, ND & MN	7,410,000	5,890,000	761,000	---	761,000	---	761,000	---
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER	24,400,000	2,275,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
	OHIO								
(FC)	CENTRAL OHIO AT NELSONVILLE (CP&E)	795,000	175,000	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY	3,315,000	2,515,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FC)	CENTRAL OHIO SURVEY AT LOGAN (CP&E)	690,000	375,000	315,000	---	315,000	---	315,000	---
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR (PHASE I)	1,420,000	1,295,000	125,000	---	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FDP)	CUYAHOGA RIVER BASIN	1,388,000	1,040,000	153,000	---	153,000	---	153,000	---
(SP)	LAKE ERIE COAST, OH, NY, PA & MI	3,131,000	825,000	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(N)	GALLIPOLIS LOCKS AND DAM, OH & WV (CP&E)	2,808,000	2,658,000	---	---	70,000	---	70,000	---
(N)	GENEVA-ON-THE-LAKE HARBOR	3,220,000	812,000	---	---	---	100,000	---	---
(FDP)	MIAMI RIVER, LITTLE MIAMI RIVER AND MILL CREEK BASIN	4,179,000	3,599,000	195,000	---	195,000	---	195,000	---
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER BASIN SURVEY AT KILLBUCK (CP&E)	895,000	250,000	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER BASIN SURVEY AT MANSFIELD (CP&E)	630,000	425,000	205,000	---	205,000	---	205,000	---
(FC)	RENO BEACH - HOWARD FARMS AREA	4,530,000	354,000	---	170,000	---	170,000	---	170,000
	OKLAHOMA								
(COMP)	ARKANSAS RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, SOUTHCENTRAL AND SOUTHEAST AREAS OF OKLAHOMA	1,100,000	---	---	---	400,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	CANADIAN RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, OK, TX, & NM	2,970,000	1,578,000	---	---	250,000	---	---	---
(FC)	PARKER LAKE (CP&E)	1,900,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	POTEAU RIVER, OK & AR	1,535,000	1,426,000	109,000	---	109,000	---	109,000	---
(SPEC)	ARK-RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL SOLAR POND STUDIES OK & TX	3,660,000	110,000	---	---	400,000	---	---	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	OREGON								
(N)	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA	7,600,000	4,352,000	---	---	---	---	2,400,000	---
(N)	COLUMBIA R COAL EXPORT ASTORIA	2,077,000	1,195,000	830,000	---	830,000	---	830,000	---
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER AND BAR	538,000	390,000	148,000	---	148,000	---	148,000	---
(MP)	MCNARY LOCK AND DAM (SECOND POWERHOUSE), OR & WA (CP&E)	4,650,000	3,150,000	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
(COMP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN (COMPREHENSIVE STUDY)	2,823,000	1,231,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
	PENNSYLVANIA								
(FDP)	ALLEGHENY RIVER BASIN	675,00C	200,000	65,000	---	65,000	---	65,000	---
(FC)	FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM (MODIFICATION)	74,500,000	2,329,000	---	1,120,000	---	1,120,000	---	1,120,000
(FDP)	KISKIMINETAS RIVER BASIN	1,515,000	755,000	80,000	---	80,000	---	80,000	---
(FDP)	LEHIGH RIVER BASIN STUDY	1,796,000	945,000	440,000	---	440,000	---	440,000	---
(FDP)	MONONGAHELA-YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, PA, MD & WV	7,595,000	4,242,000	475,000	---	575,000	---	475,000	---
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE (CP&E)	625,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	500,000	---
(FC)	SUSQUEHANNA BASIN AT HARRISBURG (CP&E)	2,900,000	948,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	TAMAQUA	8,420,000	1,125,000	---	725,000	---	725,000	---	725,000
(FDP)	WEST BRANCH SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, WILLIAMSPORT & S. WILLIAMSPORT	1,300,000	1,180,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
	PUERTO RICO								
(FDP)	LA PLATA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	910,000	608,000	212,000	---	212,000	---	212,000	---
(FDP)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA	911,000	253,000	90,000	---	90,000	---	90,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	SOUTH CAROLINA								
(FDP)	GILLS CREEK	1,799,000	847,000	452,000	—	452,000	—	452,000	—
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR (CP&E)	1,100,000	—	—	—	150,000	—	150,000	—
(FDP)	LITTLE PEE DEE & PEE DEE RIVERS, SC & NC	852,000	103,000	300,000	—	300,000	—	300,000	—
(SP)	MYRTLE BEACH	418,000	205,000	168,000	—	168,000	—	168,000	—
	SOUTH DAKOTA								
(FDP)	EASTERN SD AND UPPER BIG SIOUX RIVER, SD & IA	2,750,000	2,120,000	220,000	—	220,000	—	220,000	—
(MP)	GREGORY COUNTY HYDROELECTRIC PUMPED STORAGE FACILITY								
(MP)	(CP&E)	5,500,000	—	2,000,000	—	2,000,000	—	2,000,000	—
(FDP)	MISSOURI RIVER, SD, NE, ND & MT	7,300,000	4,862,000	745,000	—	745,000	—	745,000	—
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER YANKTON SD TO THE MOUTH KS,SD,IA,MO&NE.	540,000	—	—	—	540,000	—	—	—
(FDP)	WESTERN DAKOTAS REGION OF SD	2,090,000	1,134,000	150,000	—	150,000	—	150,000	—
	TENNESSEE								
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF NASHVILLE	3,224,000	2,609,000	95,000	—	255,000	—	75,000	—
	TEXAS								
(FDP)	BRAZOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	7,990,000	6,066,000	250,000	—	250,000	—	250,000	—
(FDP)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES TX	6,440,000	3,737,000	850,000	—	850,000	—	850,000	—
(FDP)	CAMERON COUNTY, HARLINGEN	750,000	—	—	—	200,000	—	—	—
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK	69,200,000	2,678,000	—	152,000	—	152,000	—	152,000
(FDP)	COLORADO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	4,900,000	3,924,000	300,000	—	300,000	—	300,000	—
(FC)	COLORADO RIVER & TRIBS, BOGGY CR AT AUSTIN (CP&E)	720,000	620,000	100,000	—	100,000	—	100,000	—
(FDP)	DICKINSON BAYOU	1,010,000	150,000	—	—	270,000	—	—	—

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS--Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
(N)	GALVESTON BAY AREA NAVIGATION STUDY......................	3,750,000	3,582,000	168,000	---	168,000	---	168,000	---
(FDP)	JOHNSON CREEK, ARLINGTON...............................	563,000	443,000	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS (CP&E)..	905,000	355,000	200,000	---	425,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	LITTLE CYPRESS CREEK, TX & LA.........................	1,680,000	895,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FC)	MILLICAN LAKE...	318,000,000	3,743,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES SALT WATER BARRIER.......	29,700,000	1,230,000	---	---	---	200,000	---	200,000
(SP)	PLEASURE ISLAND AT PORT ARTHUR........................	840,000	65,000	---	---	280,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	PINE ISLAND BAYOU WATERSHED............................	990,000	500,000	---	---	225,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	RED RIVER & TRIBS ABOVE DENISON DAM TX, OK, NM........	4,050,000	838,000	---	---	550,000	---	---	---
(FDP)	SAN JACINTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES.....................	3,200,000	1,927,000	300,000	---	300,000	---	300,000	---
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF HYDROPOWER...................................	17,400,000	---	---	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	TRINITY RIVER PROJECT...................................	1,090,000,000	14,002,000	---	238,000	---	238,000	---	238,000
(FC)	UPPER WHITE OAK BAYOU & TRIBS, VICINITY OF HOUSTON								
(FC)	(CP&E)..	3,225,000	814,000	400,000	---	400,000	---	400,000	---
	UTAH								
(FDP)	COLORADO RIVER & TRIBS, ABOVE LEE FERRY, UT, AZ, CO, NM & WY..	3,100,000	1,439,000	373,000	---	373,000	---	373,000	---
(FDP)	JORDAN RIVER BASIN......................................	2,000,000	1,600,000	110,000	---	110,000	---	110,000	---
	VIRGINIA								
(FDP)	CHOWAN RIVER, VA & NC..................................	2,255,000	1,982,000	273,000	---	273,000	---	273,000	---
(FC)	HAYSI LAKE..	95,000,000	3,000	---	---	---	500,000	---	---
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (DEEPENING) (CP&E)......................	12,400,000	5,600,000	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000	---
(FC)	RICHMOND (CP&E)...	2,200,000	---	---	---	1,400,000	---	---	---
(N)	YORK AND PAMUNKEY RIVERS...............................	800,000	323,000	207,000	---	207,000	---	207,000	---

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	WASHINGTON								
(N)	BLAIR & SITCUM WATERWAYS (CP&E)........................	980,000	520,000	—	—	290,000	—	—	—
(FDP)	CHEHALIS RIVER & TRIBS.................................	2,692,000	2,362,000	—	—	250,000	—	250,000	—
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER AT SOUTH ABERDEEN-COSMOPOLIS (CP&E)....	1,050,000	—	—	—	400,000	—	200,000	—
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR, CHEHALIS AND HOQUIAM RIVERS (CP&E)......	2,900,000	—	—	—	500,000	—	500,000	—
(FDP)	MILL CREEK BASIN STUDY.................................	864,000	179,000	100,000	—	100,000	—	100,000	—
(COMP)	PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS........................	7,460,000	5,545,000	350,000	—	720,000	—	350,000	—
(N)	SNOHOMISH RIVER (NAVIGATION)...........................	938,000	506,000	200,000	—	200,000	—	200,000	—
	WEST VIRGINIA								
(FDP)	GUYANDOTTE RIVER BASIN, VICINITY OF LOGAN AND MULLENS.	1,764,000	1,434,000	330,000	—	330,000	—	330,000	—
(COMP)	KANAWHA BASIN COMPREHENSIVE (AUTHORIZATION REPORTS), WV, VA & NC..	3,814,000	3,226,000	275,000	—	275,000	—	275,000	—
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER..	3,390,000	1,550,000	700,000	—	700,000	—	700,000	—
	WISCONSIN								
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR.......................................	4,450,000	290,000	—	85,000	—	85,000	—	85,000
(FC)	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES...........................	23,600,000	882,000	—	350,000	—	350,000	—	350,000
(FDP)	WISCONSIN RIVER, PORTAGE...............................	850,000	792,000	58,000	—	58,000	—	58,000	—
	REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS								
	RESTUDY OF DEFERRED PROJECTS...........................	—	—	200,000	—	465,000	—	200,000	—
	LUKFATA LAKE, OK (HYDROPOWER STUDY)..................	—	—	—	—	(265,000)	—	—	—

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECTS	---	---	550,000	---	1,140,000	---	550,000	---
	MOJAVE RIVER, CALIF	---	---	(200,000)	---	(260,000)	---	(200,000)	---
	HUGO LAKE, OK (HYDROPOWER STUDY)	---	---	---	---	(265,000)	---	---	---
	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK (HYDROPOWER STUDY)	---	---	---	---	(265,000)	---	---	---
	REVIEW FOR DEAUTHORIZATION	---	---	150,000	---	150,000	---	150,000	---
	TOTAL			900,000	---	1,755,000	---	900,000	---
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES	---	---	5,300,000	---	5,400,000	---	5,300,000	---
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA								
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)	---	---	470,000	---	470,000	---	470,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE)	---	---	295,000	---	295,000	---	295,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES	---	---	100,000	---	100,000	---	100,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES	---	---	6,500,000	---	6,500,000	---	6,500,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES	---	---	235,000	---	235,000	---	235,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS	---	---	120,000	---	120,000	---	120,000	---
	COASTAL DATA COLLECTION	---	---	1,580,000	---	1,580,000	---	1,580,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES	---	---	200,000	---	200,000	---	200,000	---
	TOTAL			9,700,000	---	9,700,000	---	9,700,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	---	---	22,000,000	---	22,500,000	---	22,000,000	---
	SUBTOTAL			101,365,000	10,435,000	135,708,000	14,425,000	112,960,000	12,225,000

Upper Gila River and Tributaries, Ariz. and N. Mex.—The Committee has provided $880,000 for the Upper Gila River and Tributaries study. The additional $350,000 is to fund and complete the Corps portion of a comprehensive flood control/water supply plan for the Upper Gila River and its tributaries.

Ohio River Main Stem Study.—The Committee has provided an additional $400,000 over the budget request for the Ohio River Main Stem study to expedite completion of the interim reports on Montgomery Locks and Dam ($150,000), Dashields Lock and Dam ($150,000), and Emsworth Locks and Dam ($100,000).

Cross-Florida Barge Canal Restudy, Fla.—The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is currently in the process of determining if additional Federal funds should be utilized to carry out a restudy of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal project. This effort is a result of advisory language included in the House report of the fiscal year 1982 supplemental appropriations bill which proposed the use of up to $450,000 for the purposes of an economic analysis of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

The Committee recognizes that this project no longer has an official sponsor at either the State or Federal level. The 1977 study by the Corps recommended against the completion of the Canal. No Federal funds for construction have been appropriated since 1970. The Florida Governor and Cabinet opposed the project and support legislation to deauthorize the Canal. The Florida Legislature has expressed similar views. The U.S. Senate has twice passed legislation to deauthorize the Canal, and legislation is presently pending in the House and the Senate to accomplish deauthorization.

Most recently the State of Florida has expressed its opposition to the restudy attempt. It is the State's position that these funds could be better spent by applying them to more environmentally acceptable projects. For this reason, the Committee believes that no further funds should be utilized for the purpose of studying the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

Pembilier, N. Dak. Flood Control Project.—The Committee has learned of the decision of the Corps of Engineers to change the base study period of the Pembilier, N. Dak. flood control project from 1940 to 1904. The Committee is not convinced that this change is warranted, particularly since all studies of the Pembina River flood control, dating back to the fifties, have been based on the 1940 study period. The Committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of the Corps of Engineers to redraft and submit to Congress a phase I general design memorandum based on the 1940 study period.

Special Flood Control Studies, Utah.—The Committee is aware of the severe flooding situation which has threatened many public facilities and residents of the Wasatch Front and Central Utah during the spring of 1983. Given the unstable nature of many flood control improvements in the area, the Committee directs the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to conduct such special flood control studies as may be necessary to determine specific ways and means to alleviate future flooding, and to concentrate its study efforts on canyon debris basins, rivers, lake tributaries, and outlets along the Wasatch Front and Central Utah. The Corps is directed to use available funds to accomplish this work during fiscal year 1984 and make its recommendations available to the State of Utah and local officials before the end of the fiscal year 1984 if possible. The Committee also expects the Corps to transmit copies of the study and recommendations to the appropriate authorizing committees for their action.

Eastern South Dakota and Upper Big Sioux River, S. Dak.—Of the funds appropriated for the Eastern South Dakota and Upper Big Sioux River, SD&IA, up to $130,000 may be transferred to the U.S. Geological Survey for hydrologic investigation of the Big Sioux aquifer supported by the State of South Dakota.

Savannah Harbor Comprehensive Study, Ga.—The Committee recommends that the scope of the current study be enlarged to consider the impacts of proposed upstream landside container facilities in conjunction with completion of the present study.

In addition to the $168,000 appropriated for this study, $125,000 of available funds is to be used to investigate these impacts.

Gulf Coast Water Study, Miss.—The Committee has included $300,000 for this comprehensive water study on the Mississippi Gulf Coast. The study is to be conducted at Federal expense with the study area including harbors and drainage areas in Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Miss. There is a lack of information concerning the extent and capability of the ground water aquifers in these coastal counties of Mississippi which have been drawn down at a rate of 2 to 4 feet a year for the past 30 to 40 years. Vertical and lateral salt water intrusion is a possibility in the future. The U.S. Geological Survey is currently developing a regional aquifer system computer model of the western Gulf Coast, which includes the tri-State area of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama. This model will define, generally, the patterns of ground water movement in these large areas, but will not provide the detailed information necessary to project the future pumping effects on the aquifers in the Coastal Streams Basin. Local interests have expressed the need to study future surface water supply alternatives. This study will address such problem areas as flood control, stream bank erosion, and water quality, as well as water supply. Possible solutions would consider best management practices to protect and control development of ground water supplies, other nonstructural, and structural measures for water supplies and flood damage reduction.

Las Vegas Wash and Tributaries, Nev.—Within available funds the Corps of Engineers is directed to use $100,000 on the Las Vegas Wash and Tributaries, Nev. flood damage prevention study.

Little Dell Lake, Utah.—Because of the recent severe flooding in the Salt Lake metropolitan area, the Corps is directed to use $400,000 of available funds to update and confirm project data related to the Little Dell Lake in Utah. The Corps of Engineers is further directed to accelerate project planning and preparation in anticipation of construction.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1983	$1,506,405,000
Budget estimate, 1984	820,700,000
House allowance	892,829,000
Committee recommendation	885,779,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+65,079,000
House allowance	−7,050,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $885,779,000.

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended. Immediately following the table, the Committee has outlined special reductions and changes made in the budgeted projects together with selected other Committee actions.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget investigations (5)	Estimates planning (6)	House investigations (7)	Allowance planning (8)	Senate investigations (9)	Allowance planning (10)
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE........	—	—	-1,400,000		-1,400,000		-6,750,000	
	TOTAL GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS....................			110,400,000		148,733,000		118,435,000	

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP)	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER
(FDP)	FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION
(SP)	SHORELINE PROTECTION
(SPEC)	SPECIAL
(COMP)	COMPREHENSIVE
(PHASE I)	AUTHORIZED FOR PHASE I STAGE OF ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN IN THE WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974 OR 1976
(CP&E)	CONTINUATION OF PLANNING AND ENGINEERING

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	ALABAMA					
(N)	TENNESSEE TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS.................	1,820,000,000	1,518,225,000	90,000,000	[1]	[1]
(N)	FRANKLIN FERRY BRIDGE, JEFFERSON COUNTY...............	4,000,000	750,000	---	1,800,000	800,000
	ALASKA					
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES....................................	263,000,000	181,349,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
(N)	KAKE HARBOR..	11,100,000	741,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
(MP)	SNETTISHAM 3RD POWER UNIT............................	69,000,000	2,920,000	---	---	6,000,000
	ARIZONA					
(FC)	INDIAN BEND WASH.....................................	34,400,000	30,596,000	3,804,000	3,804,000	3,804,000
(FC)	PHOENIX AND VICINITY (STAGE 2 & REMAINING WORK).......	288,000,000	25,917,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000
	ARKANSAS					
(N)	MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM LOCKS AND DAMS, AR & OK....................................	543,900,000	536,496,000	5,570,000	5,570,000	5,570,000
(N)	OUACHITA & BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA......................	257,000,000	193,818,000	9,200,000	12,700,000	9,200,000
(FC)	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR, LA, OK & TX..	61,100,000	49,190,000	---	6,800,000	6,800,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	CALIFORNIA					
(N)	BODEGA BAY	1,190,000	585,000	500,000	---	---
(FC)	CUCAMONGA CREEK	97,500,000	92,097,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL	322,000,000	256,087,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
(FC)	FAIRFIELD VICINITY STREAMS	19,600,000	687,000	320,000	320,000	320,000
(BE)	IMPERIAL BEACH	3,250,000	847,000	---	2,400,000	---
(FC)	LACDA LOS ANGELES RIVER CHANNEL (REHAB)	46,800,000	---	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	LOWER SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	18,000,000	13,000,000	---	5,000,000	---
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS	72,700,000	10,350,000	6,000,000	---	---
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE	376,000,000	329,689,000	7,300,000	7,300,000	7,300,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION	90,000,000	45,367,000	---	2,500,000	1,000,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER, CHICO LANDING TO RED BLUFF	13,500,000	6,645,000	---	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER & MAJOR AND MINOR TRIBUTARIES	11,900,000	11,363,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON	189,000,000	14,983,000	8,000,000	11,000,000	8,000,000
(FC)	SAN JACINTO RIVER LEV & BAUTISTA CRK CHANNEL	13,600,000	7,027,000	6,573,000	6,573,000	6,573,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER	30,600,000	1,854,000	900,000	---	---
(BE)	SURFSIDE-SUNSET & NEWPORT BEACH	33,800,000	6,214,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(FC)	SWEETWATER RIVER	21,900,000	1,480,000	---	4,900,000	---
(FC)	WALNUT CREEK	72,100,000	36,991,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
(FC)	WILDCAT & SAN PABLO CREEKS	15,400,000	1,110,000	320,000	320,000	320,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	COLORADO					
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE	96,300,000	88,535,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	CONNECTICUT					
(FC)	NEW LONDON HURRICANE BARRIER	7,770,000	6,945,000	825,000	825,000	825,000
	DELAWARE					
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST BEACH EROSION CONTROL & HURRICANE PROT.	119,000,000	1,479,000	775,000	775,000	775,000
	FLORIDA					
(BE)	BROWARD COUNTY (REIMB)	13,900,000	6,253,000	4,600,000	4,600,000	4,600,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR	24,900,000	6,162,000	---	3,000,000	1,500,000
(FC)	CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA	819,000,000	269,056,000	11,100,000	11,100,000	11,100,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY	50,400,000	33,644,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY	12,300,000	5,969,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS	198,000,000	69,071,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(BE)	PALM BEACH CO, MARTIN-LAKE WORTH, SO. LK WORTH-BROWARD (REIMB)	7,000,000	1,871,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY	13,400,000	2,540,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR-MAIN CHANNEL	177,000,000	146,575,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	GEORGIA					
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE UPPER AND LOWER DIVERSION DAMS, GA & SC (MAJOR REHAB)	7,900,000	5,200,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
(MP)	RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC	520,000,000	351,821,000	51,500,000	51,500,000	51,500,000
(MP)	WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK AND DAM (MAJOR REHAB), GA & AL	29,300,000	11,175,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	HAWAII					
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, OAHU	57,900,000	35,223,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
(FC)	KAHOMA STREAM	14,200,000	3,729,000	5,000,000	---	---
(N)	KAHULUI HARBOR, MAUI (REHAB)	2,924,000	2,264,000	660,000	660,000	660,000
	IDAHO					
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR	328,000,000	322,174,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
(MP)	LEWISTON - CLARKSTON BRIDGE, ID & WA	24,000,000	22,325,000	---	640,000	640,000
	ILLINOIS					
(FC)	EAST ST. LOUIS AND VICINITY	37,400,000	8,518,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, LOCKPORT L&D (REHAB)	19,000,000	500,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY, BRANDON ROAD L&D (REHAB)	12,600,000	---	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	KASKASKIA ISLAND DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT	15,800,000	4,243,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION	155,000,000	123,891,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM NO 26, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ALTON, IL & MO.	869,000,000	215,207,000	53,800,000	53,800,000	53,800,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAM 53, IL & KY (REHAB)	6,090,000	4,357,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	LOCKS AND DAM 52, IL & KY (REHAB)	9,130,000	8,101,000	1,029,000	1,029,000	1,029,000
(FC)	MCGEE CREEK DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT	25,500,000	17,717,000	5,600,000	5,600,000	5,600,000
(FC)	MILAN	14,700,000	6,708,000	4,830,000	4,830,000	4,830,000
(FC)	ROCKFORD	9,770,000	6,829,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(N)	SMITHLAND LOCKS AND DAM, IL, IN & KY	276,000,000	266,956,000	820,000	820,000	820,000
(FC)	WOOD RIVER DRAINAGE AND LEVEE DISTRICT	18,600,000	15,590,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
	INDIANA					
(FC)	EVANSVILLE	48,400,000	25,950,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000
	IOWA					
(FC)	BETTENDORF	14,500,000	3,767,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE	28,044,000	21,207,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	DAVENPORT	30,000,000	1,890,000	1,200,000	---	---
(FC)	LITTLE SIOUX RIVER	19,020,000	15,733,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO	207,000,000	85,478,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE	116,200,000	98,382,000	1,860,000	7,860,000	1,860,000
(FC)	WATERLOO	52,700,000	46,200,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	KANSAS					
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE......................................	90,300,000	81,109,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
	KENTUCKY					
(FC)	BIG SOUTH FORK NATIONAL RIVER & RECREATION AREA, KY & TN...	103,522,000	60,854,000	10,500,000	10,500,000	10,500,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE.......................................	80,500,000	71,551,000	1,360,000	1,360,000	1,360,000
(NP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE...................................	60,000,000	56,138,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE....................................	60,300,000	51,387,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000
(FC)	SOUTHWESTERN JEFFERSON COUNTY.........................	67,000,000	35,029,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE...................................	96,200,000	79,962,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE.....................................	96,700,000	20,045,000	—	10,000,000	10,000,000
	LOUISIANA					
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU AND TRIBUTARIES..........................	24,100,000	4,907,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY (HURRICANE PROTECTION)	468,000,000	141,514,000	16,800,000	16,800,000	16,800,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW (HURRICANE PROTECTION)........	65,500,000	26,402,000	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
(N)	LELAND BOWMAN LOCK (REPLACEMENT)......................	32,200,000	21,875,000	10,325,000	10,325,000	10,325,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET.......................	483,000,000	78,135,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF OF MEXICO..	198,000,000	15,280,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
(FC)	MORGAN CITY AND VICINITY (HURRICANE PROTECTION).......	25,800,000	1,354,000	280,000	280,000	280,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE (HURRICANE PROTECTION)..........	138,700,000	48,639,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT..	1,461,000,000	430,986,000	63,700,000	78,000,000	83,000,000
	MAINE					
(N)	JONESPORT HARBOR......................................	8,500,000	240,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
	MICHIGAN					
(FC)	SAGINAW RIVER...	48,700,000	---	---	1,165,000	---
	MARYLAND					
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS, MD & VA (50 FT PROJECT)..	271,000,000	2,750,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
	MINNESOTA					
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK...	21,600,000	1,625,000	6,000,000	---	---
(FC)	BIG STONE LAKE, WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD..............	13,300,000	10,315,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
(FC)	MANKATO & NORTH MANKATO...............................	104,000,000	49,600,000	7,200,000	7,200,000	7,200,000
(FC)	ROSEAU RIVER..	34,400,000	1,878,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	WINONA..	30,700,000	25,447,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	MISSISSIPPI					
(FC)	PEARL RIVER VICINITY OF JACKSON, MISS	26,000,000	2,500,000	---	---	16,000,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL	148,000,000	12,714,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
	MISSOURI					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT	173,000,000	3,745,000	---	4,000,000	---
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE	308,100,000	286,187,000	11,630,000	11,630,000	11,630,000
(MP)	HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	543,000,000	498,342,000	8,000,000	9,800,000	8,000,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER CHANNEL	27,300,000	21,725,000	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES	143,000,000	98,808,000	9,900,000	9,900,000	9,900,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE	20,100,000	17,811,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO & MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO & IL	231,000,000	99,746,000	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
	MONTANA					
(FC)	GREAT FALLS	11,300,000	7,932,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(MP)	LIBBY ADDITIONAL UNITS	52,800,000	41,557,000	2,600,000	2,600,000	2,600,000
	NEBRASKA					
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES	49,400,000	38,178,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	NEW JERSEY					
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET..	21,900,000	449,000	---	210,000	---
(FC)	ELIZABETH RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT.................	54,600,000	45,157,000	4,800,000	4,800,000	4,800,000
	NEW YORK					
(BE)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET TO ROCKAWAY INLET AND JAMAICA BAY.	26,800,000	12,750,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(FC)	ELLICOTT CREEK...	14,550,000	1,819,000	600,000	---	---
(FC)	FIRE ISLAND INLET TO MONTAUK POINT, LONG ISLAND.......	217,000,000	9,038,000	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	IRONDEQUOIT BAY..	4,510,000	865,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
(N)	NY HARBOR COLLECTION & REMOVAL DRIFT PROJECT, NY & NJ.	61,200,000	11,529,000	1,300,000	5,100,000	1,300,000
	NORTH CAROLINA					
(N)	AIWW-REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES...........	44,000,000	10,497,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE........................	138,000,000	94,208,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE...	167,000,000	127,171,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY...............................	110,000,000	5,531,000	---	1,000,000	---
(FC)	RANDLEMAN LAKE...	76,000,000	3,921,000	2,700,000	---	---
	NORTH DAKOTA					
(FC)	LAKE DARLING, SOURIS RIVER............................	85,200,000	1,806,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	OHIO					
(FC)	MILL CREEK...	169,000,000	18,248,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE)..........	98,000,000	4,630,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES (REHAB).........................	45,200,000	15,570,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
(FC)	NEWARK..	11,100,000	5,049,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(FC)	POINT PLACE...	9,560,000	4,299,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	OKLAHOMA					
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE..	91,400,000	55,435,000	8,300,000	8,300,000	8,300,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE...	54,900,000	52,107,000	---	1,500,000	---
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE...	113,000,000	91,865,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
	OREGON					
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA.................	640,000,000	600,013,000	18,500,000	18,500,000	18,500,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWER UNITS, OR & WA.......................	---	---	---	---	---
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, LAKE UMATILLA, OR & WA.........	519,000,000	484,320,000	4,500,000	12,500,000	13,800,000
(FC)	LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION, OR & WA...	26,400,000	14,725,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(MP)	STRUBE LAKE AND COUGAR ADDITIONAL UNIT................	---	1,775,000	---	---	---
(N)	SIUSLAU RIVER AND BAR (CONTINUATION)..................	42,500,000	5,484,000	---	---	5,600,000
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE HEPPNER.............................	34,760,000	31,816,000	2,944,000	2,944,000	2,944,000
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION................	33,400,000	23,197,000	700,000	700,000	700,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	PENNSYLVANIA					
(N)	EMSWORTH LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER (MAJOR REHAB)	36,500,000	25,715,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA & NY (MAJOR REHAB)	6,000,000	1,085,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
(N)	MONTGOMERY LOCKS AND DAM, OHIO RIVER (MAJOR REHAB)	22,100,000	---	3,700,000	3,700,000	3,700,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE	15,346,000	9,646,000	1,240,000	740,000	1,240,000
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY, PA (REMEDIAL WORK) (DEF COR)	29,400,000	16,415,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
	PUERTO RICO					
(N)	PONCE HARBOR	8,580,000	245,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS	292,000,000	85,276,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
	SOUTH CAROLINA					
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR	168,000,000	155,030,000	9,800,000	9,800,000	9,800,000
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	18,500,000	16,739,000	1,761,000	1,761,000	1,761,000
	TEXAS					
(FC)	ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL (AREA VIII)	50,700,000	44,171,000	3,329,000	3,329,000	3,329,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS	166,000,000	23,840,000	---	500,000	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	92,000,000	26,873,000	9,200,000	9,200,000	9,200,000

Tampa Harbor, Fla.—Within available funds, an additional $1,500,000 in fiscal year 1984 for the Tampa Harbor dredging project should be used to pay the costs of using a disposal site for the dredge material from the Tampa Harbor project that is approximately 30 miles off of Anna Marie Island (site 5), pending completion of an EIS. It is contemplated that site 4 (which is under study by the EPA) may be used until the EIS and the designation process has been completed on site 5.

Blue River Channel Improvement, Mo., and Canaveral Harbor, Fla.—The Committee is aware of the proposal to require increased cost sharing on the Blue River Channel Improvement, Mo., and Canaveral Harbor, Fla., projects. The Committee has funded these projects for construction since 1979 and 1964, respectively, and reaffirms its past position that once the decision on construction is made, local cooperation is set in accordance with the authorizing document. Therefore, the Committee directs the Corps of Engineers to proceed with construction of these projects on that basis.

Recreation facilities at completed projects.—Within the funds recommended for recreation facilities at completed projects, the Committee has included $5,200,000 for the Miami Harbor Bayfront, Fla. project.

Pearl River Emergency Flood Control Project, Miss.—The supplemental appropriations bill contained a provision allowing the Corps of Engineers to proceed with advanced engineering and design of emergency measures to prevent flood damages along the Pearl River in the vicinity of Jackson, Miss.

Preliminary studies indicate several improvements would reduce flooding along the Pearl River at Jackson. These improvements include, but are not limited to, a river bend cutoff, clearing of floodway, modifications to the Barnett Dam and Reservoir, and improvements that have already been implemented by the Pearl River Basin Development District at the Mississippi Highway 25 bridge.

Because of the emergency and severe nature of the flooding, the Committee has included $16,000,000 to implement these measures and directs the Corps to move as expeditiously as possible to accomplish this work.

Small Navigation Projects.—The Committee does not concur with the House Committee regarding construction of Saquatucket, Harwich, Mass. small navigation project.

Mouth of the Colorado River, Tex.—The mouth of the Colorado project has been the subject of lengthy negotiations with respect to the construction of both of its components—a navigation channel and a diversion channel that enhances national commercial fisheries. These negotiations resulted in an understanding among the several Federal agencies and the local sponsors regarding the distribution of construction costs based on the nature of the benefits. This understanding recognized that the initial construction would be on the navigation jetties; however, when dredging of the navigation portion of the project begins, the diversion channel dredging would be done. The Corps of Engineers is directed to construct the mouth of the Colorado project in accordance with the understandings that were reached on the project.

Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.—The Committee concurs with the House Committee and the House of Representatives' action as reflected in the House Committee report and in floor debate on June 6 and 7 in funding the Tennessee-Tombigbee Water project from available funds. This includes funds deferred in fiscal year 1983 which will become available to the Corps at the start of fiscal year 1984. The President's budget requests during this 2-year period reflect the winding down of construction work on this nearly-completed navigation project—from $186,000,00 last year down to $90,000,000—with a like sum for next year which can be provided from within the available deferred funds. These funds are available because the continuing resolution provided appropriations for the current fiscal year at the higher prior year appropriation level due to the failure of the last Congress to pass the regular, annual appropriations bill. As a result, these funds are available and should be used in an effort to reduce the amount of new budget (obligational) authority enacted by Congress.

The Committee's designation and use of these funds would be in the nature of a reappropriation, as was the common practice in the past when applying previous appropriations or prior year funds for use in the ensuing fiscal year. This action is not intended to show any decrease in the rate of activity leading to a scheduled September 1985 open-to-navigation date. During the House debate, it was stipulated that the remaining cost to complete the project for navigation and related features was $202,000,000. Of that amount, $180,000,000 is from the available deferred funds, and the remaining $22,000,000, if needed, from unobligated balances. This Committee agrees.

The Committee also recommends a provision which has been previously offered and adopted as a floor amendment to the appropriations act for the past 2 years limiting any expansion of the waterway project below Demopolis, Ala. In other words, no funds from this appropriation shall be used to construct any expansion of the currently authorized channel dimensions of, or to build duplicate locks for, the existing Black Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway south of Demopolis, Ala., to accommodate traffic increases on the Black Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway anticipated to be generated by completion of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. This provision is not intended to restrict necessary operation, maintenance, restoration, or rehabilitation on the existing, authorized Black Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway.

Cooper River, Charleston Harbor, S.C.—The Committee is aware of the seismic stability problems at the Santee Cooper hydroelectric project, owned and operated by the South Carolina Public Service Authority. near Moncks Corner, S.C. Earthquake-induced failure of Santee Cooper project facilities could result in considerable loss of human life and property damage along the Cooper River and in the Charleston Harbor area. Furthermore, the Federal Cooper River, Charleston Harbor, rediversion project, now under construction, could not operate as designed to reduce shoaling in Charleston Harbor. In view of the above, within available funds, the Committee directs the Corps to examine the impact that the seismic stability problems at the Santee

Cooper project could have on the Cooper River, Charleston Harbor project, to prepare a preliminary assessment of such measures as the Chief of Engineers determines necessary to improve the seismic stability of the Santee Cooper project, and to report the results of its examination and assessment to the Committee at the fiscal year 1985 appropriations hearings.

Stonewall Jackson Lake, W. Va.—The Committee has restored the $26,000,000 included in the President's budget which was deleted by the House. With an allocation to date of over $86,000,000, which has been invested in land acquisition, major relocations, and procurement of equipment for the dam, the Committee believes that the project should proceed in accordance with the funds proposed in the President's budget. The Corps testified that the project is economically justified and that, under the current bidding climate, it is receiving very favorable bids; therefore, a delay in proceeding with this project would undoubtedly increase the project costs.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Appropriations, 1983	$403,052,000
Budget estimate, 1984	290,000,000
House allowance	310,330,000
Committee recommendation	297,960,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+7,960,000
House allowance	−12,370,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $297,960,000, which is $12,370,000 below the House allowance and $7,960,000 over the budget request.

Yazoo Backwater Area, Rocky Bayou.—The Rocky Bayou area consists of 22 square miles, which is used as a highly developed agricultural area. Local interests have constructed a levee and drainage structure system; however, runoff from recent rains has overtopped the existing local levees protecting the Rocky Bayou area and caused considerable damage to the valuable lands protected by that levee. The Committee considers it essential to the protection of the approximately 22 square miles in the area that the authorized Federal project, providing a more secure levee system, be constructed instead of a temporary emergency repair. Therefore, the Committee has provided an additional $2,900,000 and directs the Corps of Engineers to proceed with construction of the authorized project for the Rocky Bayou area of the Yazoo basin project in Mississippi.

St. Francis Basin Project.—The Committee is concerned that the Corps of Engineers is allocating a disproportionate amount of the available resources for the St. Francis Basin project to non-construction items. The Committee urges the Corps to reexamine this procedure and to apply more resources on construction activities that could expedite work in both the southern and northern portions of the project.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds recommended with the budget request and the House allowance for activities and projects under this heading.

Yazoo Backwater Pumping Plant, Miss.—The Committee is aware of the recent flooding in the Yazoo backwater area of the Yazoo Basin project which caused and estimated $19,000,000 in damages that could have been prevented if the Yazoo backwater pumping plant were in place. Accordingly, the Committee has added $2,000,000 to expedite completion of planning and engineering. In an effort to accelerate the schedule for completion of this project the Corps should give consideration to contracting with private sector for engineering and design work.

L'Anguille River Basin, Ark.—Within available funds, the Corps is directed to use $500,000 to advance the planning on the L'Anguille River Basin project.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
(BE)	CORPUS CHRISTI BEACH (RESTORATION PROJECT)............	2,550,000	1,555,000	995,000	995,000	995,000
(FC)	EL PASO..	66,500,000	42,179,000	4,550,000	4,550,000	4,550,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR................................	51,000,000	493,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
(N)	FREEPORT HARBOR (RELOCATION OF NORTH JETTY)...........	12,900,000	3,775,000	3,350,000	---	---
(FC)	HIGHLAND BAYOU.................................	21,900,000	12,138,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE (FORMERLY LAKEVIEW LAKE)................	196,000,000	125,088,000	22,800,000	25,800,000	22,800,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER............................	29,900,000	3,000,000	---	---	5,000,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE...............................	292,000,000	65,395,000	42,000,000	42,000,000	42,000,000
(FC)	RED RIVER LEVEES & BANK STAB. BELOW DENNISON DAM TX, AR & LA..	57,100,000	55,500,000	---	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT.......................	74,200,000	37,718,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
(FC)	SAN GABRIEL RIVER..............................	150,600,000	101,402,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU..................................	71,200,000	4,543,000	2,600,000	3,100,000	2,600,000
(FC)	VINCE AND LITTLE VINCE BAYOUS.........................	20,900,000	8,368,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE...............................	52,800,000	24,820,000	---	300,000	---
	VIRGINIA					
(FC)	VIRGINIA BEACH STREAMS, CANAL NO TWO..................	3,800,000	2,589,000	1,211,000	---	---
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (1962 MODIFICATION) (REIMB)........	5,500,000	3,510,000	430,000	430,000	430,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	WASHINGTON					
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM ADDITIONAL UNITS......................	366,000,000	322,434,000	16,700,000	16,700,000	16,700,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL (REHAB).....................	8,620,000	4,900,000	3,720,000	3,720,000	3,720,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE DAM, WA & ID..........................	330,400,000	321,600,000	---	8,500,000	---
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR & ID..	177,000,000	72,650,000	18,700,000	23,000,000	18,700,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE (REHAB)..............................	15,800,000	13,026,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
	WEST VIRGINIA					
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE......................................	47,300,000	38,292,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE......................................	55,400,000	54,345,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
(FC)	LEVISA & TUG FORKS OF BIG SANDY RVR & CUMBERLAND RVR, WV, VA & KY..	191,000,000	30,400,000	600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE......................................	195,000,000	191,322,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE...............................	205,000,000	82,710,000	26,000,000	---	26,000,000
	MISCELLANEOUS					
	SMALL NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107)................	---	---	2,300,000	3,700,000	2,300,000
	MITIGATION OF SHORE DAMAGES ATTRIBUTABLE TO NAV PROJ (SECTION 111)..	---	---	550,000	550,000	550,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Type of project (1)	Project title (2)	Total Federal cost (3)	Allocated to date (4)	Budget estimate (5)	House allowance (6)	Senate allowance (7)
	SMALL BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103)	---	---	1,800,000	3,800,000	1,800,000
	SMALL PROJECTS FOR FLOOD CONTROL & RELATED PURPOSES (SECTION 205)	---	---	16,400,000	18,200,000	16,400,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SECTION 14)	---	---	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	SMALL SNAGGING & CLEARING PROJECTS (SECTION 208)	---	---	250,000	375,000	250,000
	RECREATION FACILITIES AT COMPLETED PROJECTS	---	---	8,000,000	13,500,000	12,000,000
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT)	---	---	5,000,000	10,000,000	5,000,000
	EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION	---	---	9,400,000	9,400,000	9,400,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE	---	---	-139,446,000	-89,446,000	-89,446,000
	FUNDS AVAILABLE FROM FY 1983 DEFERRAL	---	---	-40,000,000	---	---
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL			820,700,000	892,829,000	885,779,000

1/ Funded from FY 1983 deferred funds, reducing new budget authority

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N)	NAVIGATION
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL
(MP)	MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS				
SURVEYS:				
GENERAL STUDIES:				
BOEUF-TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA......................	6,160,000	185,000	985,000	185,000
LARTO LAKE-SALINE AREA, LA......................	1,330,000	---	240,000	---
ST. FRANCIS RIVER BASIN BELOW WAPPAPELLO LAKE, AR & MO....................................	2,980,000	585,000	585,000	585,000
MAYFIELD CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, KY...............	850,000	320,000	320,000	320,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN (WATER & LAND RESOURCES), LA...	6,680,000	235,000	350,000	235,000
YAZOO RIVER BASIN, MS...........................	8,320,000	225,000	900,000	225,000
MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS........	1,102,000	---	60,000	60,000
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA..................	---	260,000	260,000	260,000
ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:				
EASTERN RAPIDES & SOUTH CENTRAL AVOYELLES........	57,900,000	---	280,000	---
L'ANGUILLE RIVER BASIN, AR......................	24,900,000	300,000	500,000	300,000
MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION SALINITY CONTROL STRUCTURE, LA................................	33,200,000	800,000	1,200,000	800,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS...............		2,910,000	5,680,000	2,970,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriations, 1983	$1,187,667,000
Budget estimate, 1984	1,161,300,000
House allowance	1,215,032,000
Committee recommendation	1,170,620,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+9,320,000
House allowance	−44,412,000

An appropriation of $1,170,620,000 is recommended, which is $44,412,000 below the House allowance and $9.320,000 above the budget request.

The Committee is aware of growing operation and maintenance requirements nationwide, and the continuously changing needs and priorities. It is often necessary to accomplish work scheduled for the budget year in the current year, and it is not uncommon for the Corps to divert operation and maintenance funds to unscheduled emergency maintenance requirements.

The funding recommended is the largest level ever provided for operation and maintenance activities. The Committee is aware of the efforts of the Corps to stretch the scarce O&M dollars to cover all of its projects and to effect savings through a variety of methods. As more and more projects come into the inventory and fiscal constraints reduce budgetary resources, it is clear that the Corps will need to change its traditional approach to undertaking the required O&M work nationwide. Adjustments in lower priority programs and noncritical work should be considered. However, in optimizing its use of the limited resources available, the Corps should insure maximum public benefits for navigation, hydropower, and flood control.

The 1984 budget request was based on estimates which were developed 18 months ago. Maintenance dredging requirements in navigation channels vary with weather conditions, equipment availability, and usage. Further, good bid experience could free-up additional dollars to accomplish unscheduled work. Specific allocations impede the Corps' ability to adjust to continuously changing needs. Only if the Corps' financial flexibility to respond to emergencies and other unanticipated urgent requirements is preserved can the Chief of Engineers carry out his responsibility to perform the O&M work of greatest overall importance to the Nation.

The Committee is aware of a heavy shoaling condition which exists in the navigation channel to the turning basin at Port Orford, Oreg. Within available funds, the Corps is directed to provide additional dredging for the existing port and marine facilities.

The Committee is aware of a severe safety problem related to the turning basin at Brunswick Harbor, Ga. Within available funds, the Corps is to provide such sums as may be necessary to eliminate this dangerous safety condition.

The Committee has been informed of the annual shoaling problem in the Five Fathom Creek inlet at McClellanville, that seriously impedes the local fishing industry. The Corps has recognized this situation and has scheduled a side caster dredge to the work. Last year a small hopper dredge was assigned to this work and was able to do a much better job in a much shorter period of time than the previous local experience with side caster dredges. The Committee strongly recommends that a small hopper dredge, if available, be scheduled for the work at McClellanville.

The attention of the Corps is directed to the following projects in need of maintenance and for which the Committee has received testimony and funding requests—the need for maintenance dredging at Savannah Harbor, Ga.; the Trinity River channel to Liberty, Tex.; and the Wolf and Jordan Rivers, Miss.

The following table is included for illustrative purposes only and shows the estimated work allowances for fiscal year 1983:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
ALABAMA		
ALABAMA-COOSA RIVERS	4,443,000	4,443,000
BAYOU CODEN	225,000	225,000
BLACK WARRIOR & TOMBIGBEE RIVERS	9,814,000	9,814,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (MOBILE DISTRICT)	2,695,000	2,695,000
MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM-WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAKE	2,963,000	2,963,000
MOBILE HARBOR	3,893,000	3,893,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	60,000	60,000
ROBERT F. HENRY LOCK & DAM	2,423,000	2,423,000
TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS	7,201,000	7,201,000
ALASKA		
ANCHORAGE HARBOR	1,790,000	1,790,000
CHENA RIVER LAKES	708,000	708,000
DILLINGHAM SMALL BOAT HARBOR	495,000	495,000
HOMER HARBOR	370,000	370,000
KING COVE HARBOR	920,000	920,000
NINILCHIK SMALL BOAT HARBOR	345,000	345,000
NOME HARBOR	883,000	883,000
STIKINE RIVER SNAGGING	18,000	18,000
ARIZONA		
ALAMO LAKE	632,000	632,000
PAINTED ROCK DAM	622,000	622,000
WHITLOW RANCH DAM	645,000	645,000
ARKANSAS		
BEAVER LAKE	1,908,000	1,908,000
BLAKELY MOUNTAIN DAM, LAKE OUACHITA	2,769,000	2,769,000
BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE	533,000	533,000
BULL SHOALS LAKE	2,975,000	2,975,000
DARDANELLE LOCK & DAM	2,927,000	2,927,000
DEGRAY LAKE	2,648,000	2,648,000
DEQUEEN LAKE	515,000	515,000
DIERKS LAKE	527,000	527,000
GILLHAM LAKE	414,000	414,000
GREERS FERRY LAKE	2,238,000	2,238,000
HELENA HARBOR	330,000	330,000
MCCLELLAN-KERR ARK RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM LOCKS & DAMS, AR & OK	14,866,000	14,866,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
MILLWOOD LAKE	1,253,000	1,253,000
NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON	2,315,000	2,315,000
NIMROD LAKE	589,000	589,000
NORFORK LAKE	1,874,000	1,874,000
OSCEOLA HARBOR	650,000	650,000
OUACHITA & BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA	3,675,000	3,675,000
OZARK-JETA TAYLOR LOCK & DAM	4,026,000	4,026,000
WHITE RIVER	2,090,000	2,090,000
CALIFORNIA		
BLACK BUTTE LAKE	1,530,000	1,530,000
BUCHANAN DAM - H. V. EASTMAN LAKE	1,073,000	1,073,000
COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO)	1,497,000	1,497,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR & BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL)	1,543,000	1,543,000
DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE & CHANNEL	1,553,000	1,553,000
FARMINGTON DAM	133,000	133,000
HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE	1,037,000	1,037,000
HUMBOLDT HARBOR & BAY	3,503,000	3,503,000
ISABELLA LAKE	2,704,000	2,704,000
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA	2,708,000	2,708,000
LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBORS MODEL	125,000	125,000
LOS ANGELES-LONG BEACH HARBORS	70,000	70,000
MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP	135,000	135,000
MOJAVE RIVER DAM	542,000	542,000
MOSS LANDING HARBOR	676,000	676,000
NEW HOGAN LAKE	998,000	998,000
NEW MELONES LAKE (DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL)	531,000	531,000
NOYO RIVER & HARBOR	413,000	413,000
OAKLAND HARBOR	1,929,000	1,929,000
OCEANSIDE HARBOR	800,000	800,000
PETALUMA RIVER	1,000,000	1,000,000
PINE FLAT LAKE	1,527,000	1,527,000
RICHMOND HARBOR	1,912,000	1,912,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FT PROJECT)	2,543,000	2,543,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL	93,000	93,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER & TRIBS (DEBRIS CONTROL)	721,000	721,000
SAN DIEGO HARBOR (ZUNIGA JETTY)	500,000	500,000
SAN FRANCISCO BAY -- DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE	1,141,000	1,141,000
SAN DIEGO RIVER AND MISSION BAY	545,000	545,000
SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR	2,332,000	2,332,000
SAN PABLO BAY & MARE ISLAND STRAIT	6,633,000	6,633,000
SAN JOAQUIN RIVER	200,000	200,000
SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN	2,197,000	2,197,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
SANTA CRUZ HARBOR	519,000	519,000
SANTA BARBARA HARBOR	1,110,000	1,110,000
SUCCESS LAKE	986,000	986,000
SUISUN BAY CHANNEL	732,000	732,000
TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH)	1,158,000	1,158,000
YUBA RIVER	25,000	25,000
COLORADO		
BEAR CREEK LAKE	351,000	351,000
CHATFIELD LAKE	456,000	456,000
CHERRY CREEK LAKE	955,000	955,000
JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR	761,000	761,000
TRINIDAD LAKE	493,000	493,000
CONNECTICUT		
BLACK ROCK LAKE	216,000	216,000
COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE	177,000	177,000
CONNECTICUT RIVER BELOW HARTFORD	1,452,000	1,452,000
HANCOCK BROOK LAKE	106,000	106,000
HOP BROOK LAKE	347,000	347,000
MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE	206,000	206,000
NEW HAVEN HARBOR	2,629,000	2,629,000
NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE	159,000	159,000
STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER	101,000	101,000
THOMASTON DAM	257,000	257,000
WEST THOMPSON LAKE	309,000	309,000
DELAWARE		
INDIAN RIVER INLET & BAY	35,000	35,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE RIVER TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, DE & MD	8,126,000	8,126,000
IWW CHINCOTEAGUE BAY TO DELAWARE BAY	12,000	12,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR	1,627,000	1,627,000
DIST OF COLUMBIA		
POTOMAC & ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL)	572,000	572,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
FLORIDA		
APALACHICOLA BAY	103,000	103,000
CANAVERAL HARBOR	2,607,000	2,607,000
CENTRAL & SOUTHERN FLORIDA	4,145,000	4,145,000
CHARLOTTE HARBOR	1,245,000	745,000
CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL	239,000	239,000
EAST PASS CHANNEL	626,000	626,000
FERNANDINA HARBOR	1,810,000	1,810,000
INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI	1,619,000	1,619,000
JACKSONVILLE HARBOR	2,711,000	2,711,000
OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY	1,732,000	1,732,000
PENSACOLA HARBOR	880,000	880,000
PORT ST. JOE HARBOR	1,731,000	1,731,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH	2,102,000	2,102,000
TAMPA HARBOR	8,225,000	8,225,000
GEORGIA		
ALLATOONA LAKE	4,001,000	4,001,000
APALACHICOLA, CHATTAHOOCHEE & FLINT RIVERS, GA,AL&FL	4,050,000	4,050,000
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (SAVANNAH DISTRICT)	712,000	712,000
BRUNSWICK HARBOR	3,462,000	3,462,000
BUFORD DAM & LAKE SIDNEY LANIER	4,408,000	4,408,000
CARTERS LAKE	2,012,000	2,012,000
CLARKS HILL LAKE, GA & SC	3,831,000	3,831,000
HARTWELL LAKE	3,759,000	3,759,000
JIM WOODRUFF LOCK & DAM, GA & FL	3,031,000	3,031,000
RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM & LAKE, GA & SC	944,000	944,000
SAVANNAH HARBOR	8,211,000	8,211,000
SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA	166,000	166,000
WALTER F. GEORGE LOCK & DAM, GA & AL	3,340,000	3,340,000
WEST POINT LAKE, GA & AL	3,452,000	3,452,000
IDAHO		
ALBENI FALLS DAM	2,013,000	2,013,000
DWORSHAK DAM & RESERVOIR	5,282,000	5,282,000
LUCKY PEAK LAKE	939,000	939,000
ILLINOIS		
CALUMET HARBOR & RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL), IL & IN	4,000,000	4,000,000
CARLYLE LAKE	2,180,000	2,180,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
CONSTRUCTION				
CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN......	3,055,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, & TN	1,516,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
ST. FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO............................	351,000,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
TENSAS BASIN, AR & LA:	(495,000,000)	(14,840,000)	(14,840,000)	(14,840,000)
BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, EXCEPT LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT..................................	---	800,000	800,000	800,000
BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, LAKE CHICOT PUMPING PLANT	---	11,950,000	11,950,000	11,950,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, EXCEPT TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT..................................	---	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, TENSAS COCODRIE PUMPING PLANT.......................................	---	790,000	790,000	790,000
TENSAS WILDLIFE REFUGE................................	40,000,000	---	10,000,000	15,000,000
REELFOOT LAKE - LAKE NO. 9, KY & TN...................	10,840,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.................................	1,752,000,000	23,800,000	23,800,000	23,800,000
BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA....................	25,000,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
LOWER RED RIVER-SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA.................	42,000,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
OLD RIVER, LA...	320,000,000	65,940,000	65,940,000	65,940,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(1,625,000,000)	(14,340,000)	(21,900,000)	(14,340,000)
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER..............................	---	3,324,000	3,324,000	3,324,000
GREENWOOD..	---	290,000	290,000	290,000
MAIN STEM..	---	613,000	613,000	613,000
TRIBUTARIES:				
EXCEPT ASCALMORE-TIPPO AND OPPOSSUM BAYOUS......	---	3,032,000	5,792,000	3,032,000
ASCALMORE-TIPPO AND OPPOSSUM BAYOUS.............	---	1,698,000	4,898,000	1,698,000
UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS (FORMERLY AUXILIARY CHANNEL).	---	4,236,000	5,836,000	4,236,000
YAZOO BACKWATER..................................	---	1,147,000	1,147,000	4,047,000
YAZOO BACKWATER PUMPING PLANT....................	200,000,000	---	---	2,000,000
WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN..................	89,400,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION...........................		205,950,000	223,510,000	225,850,000
MAINTENANCE				
BOEUF-TENSAS BASIN, AR AND LA....................	---	273,000	273,000	273,000
WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR........................	---	640,000	640,000	640,000
MAPPING, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN............	---	90,000	90,000	90,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	---	16,886,000	16,886,000	16,886,000
NORTH BANK, ARKANSAS RIVER, AR...................	---	177,000	177,000	177,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SOUTH BANK, ARKANSAS RIVER, AR........................	---	290,000	290,000	290,000
ST. FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO.....................	---	3,920,000	3,920,000	3,920,000
ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA................................	---	4,795,000	4,795,000	4,795,000
BAYOU COCODRIE & TRIBUTARIES, LA.....................	---	53,000	53,000	53,000
BONNET CARRE SPILLWAY, LA............................	---	242,000	242,000	242,000
LOWER RED RIVER, SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA...............	---	264,000	264,000	264,000
OLD RIVER LA...	---	4,772,000	4,772,000	4,772,000
RED RIVER BACKWATER AREA, LA.........................	---	195,000	195,000	195,000
ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS...................................	---	1,663,000	1,663,000	1,663,000
BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS..............................	---	147,000	147,000	147,000
ENID LAKE, MS..	---	1,996,000	1,996,000	1,996,000
GREENWOOD, MS..	---	403,000	403,000	403,000
GRENADA LAKE, MS.....................................	---	2,399,000	2,399,000	2,399,000
YAZOO BASIN, MAIN STEM, MS...........................	---	1,083,000	1,083,000	1,083,000
SARDIS LAKE, MS......................................	---	2,618,000	2,618,000	2,618,000
YAZOO BASIN, TRIBUTARIES, MS.........................	---	894,000	894,000	894,000
WHITTINGTON AUXILIARY CHANNEL, MS....................	---	236,000	236,000	236,000
YAZOO BACKWATER, MS..................................	---	202,000	202,000	202,000
YAZOO CITY, MS.......................................	---	247,000	247,000	247,000
WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO..................................	---	1,460,000	1,460,000	1,460,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
REVETMENT AND DIKES................................	---	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000
DREDGING...	---	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS.......................	---	400,000	400,000	400,000
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE..........................		95,345,000	95,345,000	95,345,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS, SLIPPAGE, AND UNOBLIGATED BALANCES................................	---	-14,205,000	-14,205,000	-26,205,000
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER & TRIBUTARIES.		290,000,000	310,330,000	297,960,000

TYPE OF STUDY OR PROJECT:
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
CHICAGO HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	700,000	700,000
CHICAGO RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	770,000	770,000
CHICAGO RIVER	380,000	380,000
FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS	102,000	102,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL & IN (NCD)	10,329,000	10,329,000
ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION)	1,135,000	1,135,000
KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION	910,000	910,000
LAKE SHELBYVILLE	2,685,000	2,685,000
MILL CREEK & SOUTH SLOUGH	35,000	35,000
MISS RIV BTWN MISSOURI RIV & MINNEAPOLIS, IL, MN, WI, & IA (NCD)	44,620,000	44,620,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER BTW OHIO & MISSOURI RIVERS	8,766,000	8,766,000
MISS RIV BTWN MO RIVER & MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD)	5,545,000	5,545,000
MOUTH OF SANGAMON RIVER	23,000	23,000
REND LAKE	1,740,000	1,740,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	374,000	374,000
WAUKEGAN HARBOR	659,000	659,000
INDIANA		
BROOKVILLE LAKE	461,000	461,000
CAGLES MILL LAKE	384,000	384,000
CECIL M. HARDEN LAKE	591,000	591,000
HUNTINGTON LAKE	545,000	545,000
INDIANA HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	400,000	400,000
MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR	21,000	21,000
MISSISSINEWA LAKE	461,000	461,000
MONROE LAKE	424,000	424,000
PATOKA LAKE	449,000	449,000
SALAMONIE LAKE	387,000	387,000
IOWA		
CORALVILLE LAKE	2,303,000	2,303,000
MISSOURI RIVER, KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA&NE	57,000	57,000
MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA & NE	9,447,000	9,447,000
RATHBUN LAKE	1,312,000	1,312,000
RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK	2,646,000	2,646,000
SAYLORVILLE LAKE	2,315,000	2,315,000
KANSAS		
CLINTON LAKE	1,092,000	1,092,000
COUNCIL GROVE LAKE	604,000	604,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowanc (3
EL DORADO LAKE	311,000	311,000
ELK CITY LAKE	530,000	530,000
FALL RIVER LAKE	538,000	538,000
HILLSDALE LAKE	421,000	421,000
JOHN REDMOND DAM & RESERVOIR	608,000	608,000
KANOPOLIS LAKE	1,072,000	1,072,000
MARION LAKE	585,000	585,000
MELVERN LAKE	1,094,000	1,094,000
MILFORD LAKE	1,100,000	1,100,000
PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE	503,000	503,000
PERRY LAKE	1,424,000	1,424,000
POMONA LAKE	1,304,000	1,304,000
TORONTO LAKE	252,000	252,000
TUTTLE CREEK LAKE	1,155,000	1,155,000
WILSON LAKE	1,025,000	1,025,000
KENTUCKY		
BARKLEY DAM - LAKE BARKLEY	3,825,000	3,825,000
BARREN RIVER LAKE	872,000	872,000
BUCKHORN LAKE	761,000	761,000
CARR FORK LAKE	781,000	781,000
CAVE RUN LAKE	497,000	497,000
DEWEY LAKE	965,000	965,000
FISHTRAP LAKE	710,000	710,000
GRAYSON LAKE	915,000	915,000
GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY & TN	1,276,000	1,276,000
GREEN RIVER LAKE	902,000	902,000
HICKMAN HARBOR	300,000	300,000
KENTUCKY RIVER	960,000	960,000
LAUREL RIVER LAKE	743,000	743,000
MARTINS FORK LAKE	463,000	463,000
MIDDLESBORO	37,000	37,000
NOLIN LAKE	979,000	979,000
OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK	8,210,000	8,210,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS & DAMS	12,053,000	12,053,000
PAINTSVILLE LAKE	530,000	530,000
ROUGH RIVER LAKE	946,000	946,000
TAYLORSVILLE LAKE	375,000	375,000
WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND	3,386,000	3,386,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
LOUISIANA		
ATCHAFALAYA RIVER & BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF & BLACK.......	7,000,000	7,000,000
BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY..................................	3,000,000	3,000,000
BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR..................................	815,000	815,000
BAYOU RIGOLETTE...	—	500,000
BAYOU TECHE...	210,000	210,000
CADDO LAKE..	245,000	245,000
CALCASIEU RIVER & PASS..................................	13,762,000	13,762,000
FRESHWATER BAYOU..	2,020,000	2,020,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY..............................	12,470,000	12,470,000
HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL..................................	3,000,000	3,000,000
LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR..................................	343,000	343,000
MADISON PARISH PORT.....................................	398,000	398,000
MERMENTAU RIVER...	700,000	700,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER GULF OUTLET...........................	8,480,000	8,480,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE.....................	1,000,000	1,000,000
MISSISSIPPI RIVER, BATON ROUGE TO THE GULF..............	26,428,000	26,428,000
PEARL RIVER...	170,000	170,000
RED RIVER WATERWAY MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT....	1,075,000	1,075,000
REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH...............................	1,200,000	1,200,000
WALLACE LAKE..	185,000	185,000
WATERWAY FROM IWW TO BAYOU DULAC........................	640,000	640,000
MARYLAND		
BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)........................	241,000	241,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR & CHANNELS.............................	17,459,000	17,459,000
BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS).	481,000	481,000
BLOOMINGTON LAKE, MD & WV...............................	770,000	770,000
CHESTER RIVER...	391,000	391,000
CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV, MD & WV................	52,000	52,000
OCEAN CITY HARBOR & INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY............	1,400,000	1,400,000
WICOMICO RIVER..	880,000	880,000
MASSACHUSETTS		
BARRE FALLS DAM...	219,000	219,000
BIRCH HILL DAM..	275,000	275,000
BUFFUMVILLE LAKE..	267,000	267,000
CAPE COD CANAL..	6,806,000	6,806,000
CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA...............	32,000	32,000
CONANT BROOK DAM..	62,000	62,000
EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE.....................................	195,000	195,000
FALL RIVER HARBOR, MA & RI..............................	1,722,000	1,722,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
HODGES VILLAGE DAM	246,000	246,000
KNIGHTVILLE DAM	774,000	774,000
LITTLEVILLE LAKE	252,000	252,000
NEW BEDFORD, FAIRHAVEN & ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER	1,339,000	1,339,000
TULLY LAKE	232,000	232,000
WESTVILLE LAKE	226,000	226,000
WEST HILL DAM	200,000	200,000
MICHIGAN		
ARCADIA HARBOR	35,000	35,000
AU SABLE HARBOR	19,000	19,000
BIG BAY HARBOR	17,000	17,000
BLACK RIVER PORT HURON	31,000	31,000
BLACK RIVER HARBOR	17,000	17,000
CHANNELS IN LAKE ST. CLAIR	1,415,000	1,415,000
CHARLEVOIX HARBOR	24,000	24,000
CHEBOYGAN HARBOR	114,000	114,000
CLINTON HARBOR	26,000	26,000
DETROIT RIVER	5,286,000	5,286,000
DETROIT RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	829,000	829,000
EAGLE HARBOR	17,000	17,000
FRANKFORT HARBOR	222,000	222,000
GRAND HAVEN HARBOR & GRAND RIVER	272,000	272,000
GRAND TRAVERSE BAY HARBOR	276,000	276,000
HAMMOND BAY HARBOR	39,000	39,000
HARRISONVILLE HARBOR	34,000	34,000
HOLLAND HARBOR	2,371,000	2,371,000
INLAND ROUTE	84,000	84,000
KEWEENAW WATERWAY	52,000	52,000
LELAND HARBOR	20,000	20,000
LEXINGTON HARBOR	22,000	22,000
LITTLE LAKE HARBOR	46,000	46,000
LUDINGTON HARBOR	464,000	464,000
MANISTIQUE HARBOR	22,000	22,000
MANISTEE HARBOR	290,000	290,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	84,000	84,000
MENOMINEE HARBOR	568,000	568,000
MONROE HARBOR	1,154,000	1,154,000
MONROE HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	9,000,000	9,000,000
MUSKEGON HARBOR	556,000	556,000
NEW BUFFALO HARBOR	67,000	67,000
ONTONAGON HARBOR	42,000	42,000
PENTWATER HARBOR	38,000	38,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
POINT LOOKOUT HARBOR	32,000	32,000
PORT SANILAC HARBOR	233,000	233,000
PORT AUSTIN	21,000	21,000
PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR	237,000	237,000
ROUGE RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	334,000	334,000
ROUGE RIVER	868,000	868,000
SAGINAW RIVER	143,000	143,000
SAGINAW RIVER (DIKED DISPOSAL)	238,000	238,000
SAUGATUCK HARBOR	38,000	38,000
SEBEWAING RIVER	20,000	20,000
SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR	279,000	279,000
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	82,000	82,000
ST. MARYS RIVER	9,008,000	9,008,000
ST. JOSEPH HARBOR	846,000	846,000
ST. CLAIR RIVER	1,948,000	1,948,000
WHITE LAKE HARBOR	44,000	44,000
MINNESOTA		
BIG STONE LAKE AND WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD	113,000	113,000
DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI	2,171,000	2,171,000
GRAND MARAIS HARBOR	21,000	21,000
LAC QUI PARLE LAKE	271,000	271,000
MINNESOTA RIVER	200,000	200,000
ORWELL LAKE	158,000	158,000
RED LAKE RESERVOIR	51,000	51,000
RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER	1,329,000	1,329,000
ST. CROIX RIVER, MN & WI	150,000	150,000
MISSISSIPPI		
BILOXI HARBOR	753,000	753,000
GULFPORT HARBOR	1,890,000	1,890,000
OKATIBBEE LAKE	684,000	684,000
PASCAGOULA HARBOR	2,874,000	2,874,000
ROSEDALE HARBOR	303,000	303,000
MISSOURI		
CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR	275,000	275,000
CLARENCE CANNON DAM & RESERVOIR	1,925,000	1,925,000
CLEARWATER LAKE	1,200,000	1,200,000
HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR	3,684,000	3,684,000
LONG BRANCH LAKE	439,000	439,000
MERAMEC PARK LAKE	465,000	465,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
NEW MADRID HARBOR....................................	12,000	12,000
POMME DE TERRE LAKE..................................	1,314,000	1,314,000
SMITHVILLE LAKE......................................	553,000	553,000
STOCKTON LAKE..	1,929,000	1,929,000
TABLE ROCK LAKE......................................	2,467,000	2,467,000
MONTANA		
FORT PECK LAKE.......................................	2,677,000	2,677,000
LIBBY DAM (LAKE KOOCANUSA)...........................	2,926,000	2,926,000
NEBRASKA		
GAVINS POINT DAM - LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD......	3,350,000	3,350,000
HARLAN COUNTY LAKE...................................	1,158,000	1,158,000
PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES..................	208,000	208,000
SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES.....................	431,000	431,000
NEVADA		
MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA...........................	821,000	821,000
PINE & MATHEWS CANYONS LAKE..........................	240,000	240,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE		
BLACKWATER DAM.......................................	196,000	196,000
EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE................................	237,000	237,000
FRANKLIN FALLS DAM...................................	335,000	335,000
HOPKINTON-EVERETT LAKES..............................	584,000	584,000
OTTER BROOK LAKE.....................................	351,000	351,000
PORTSMOUTH HARBOR & PISCATAQUA RIVER.................	497,000	497,000
SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE..................................	589,000	589,000
NEW JERSEY		
ABSECON INLET..	125,000	125,000
BARNEGAT INLET.......................................	485,000	485,000
COLD SPRING INLET....................................	350,000	350,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE..	22,246,000	22,246,000
DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO TRENTON, NJ & PA......	3,712,000	3,712,000
NEW JERSEY IWW.......................................	240,000	240,000
NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK & PASSAIC RIVERS..............	9,373,000	9,373,000
RARITAN RIVER..	3,163,000	3,163,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
NEW MEXICO		
ABIQUIU DAM	837,000	837,000
COCHITI LAKE	994,000	994,000
CONCHAS LAKE	772,000	772,000
GALISTEO DAM	105,000	105,000
JEMEZ CANYON DAM	200,000	200,000
SANTA ROSA DAM & LAKE	463,000	463,000
TWO RIVERS DAM	146,000	146,000
NEW YORK		
ALMOND LAKE	200,000	200,000
ARKPORT DAM	133,000	133,000
BAY RIDGE & RED HOOK CHANNELS	736,000	736,000
BLACK ROCK CHANNEL & TONAWANDA HARBOR	945,000	945,000
BUFFALO HARBOR	2,220,000	2,220,000
EAST SIDNEY LAKE	243,000	243,000
HUDSON RIVER	1,060,000	1,060,000
LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR	240,000	240,000
MT. MORRIS LAKE	915,000	915,000
NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN	28,000	28,000
NEW YORK HARBOR	8,392,000	8,392,000
NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY & NJ	5,450,000	5,450,000
NEW YORK HARBOR DRIFT REMOVAL	1,890,000	1,890,000
NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	462,000	462,000
OSWEGO HARBOR	390,000	390,000
ROCHESTER HARBOR	905,000	905,000
SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS	383,000	383,000
WHITNEY POINT LAKE	287,000	287,000
NORTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (WILMINGTON DISTRICT)	3,889,000	3,889,000
B. EVERETT JORDAN DAM & LAKE	852,000	852,000
BEAUFORT HARBOR	293,000	293,000
CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON	412,000	412,000
CHANNEL FROM BACK SOUND TO LOOKOUT BIGHT	359,000	359,000
FALLS LAKE	823,000	823,000
LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER	20,000	20,000
MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY	2,116,000	2,116,000
MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR	3,731,000	3,731,000
SILVER LAKE HARBOR	480,000	480,000
W. KERR SCOTT DAM & RESERVOIR	969,000	969,000
WILMINGTON HARBOR	3,614,000	3,614,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
NORTH DAKOTA		
BOWMAN - HALEY LAKE	167,000	167,000
GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA	5,333,000	5,333,000
HOMME LAKE AND DAM	69,000	69,000
LAKE ASHTABULA & BALDHILL DAM	888,000	888,000
PIPESTEM LAKE	307,000	307,000
OHIO		
ALUM CREEK LAKE	430,000	430,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR	920,000	920,000
ASHTABULA HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	1,400,000	1,400,000
BERLIN LAKE	1,126,000	1,126,000
CAESAR CREEK LAKE	516,000	516,000
CLARENCE J. BROWN DAM	468,000	468,000
CLEVELAND HARBOR	4,740,000	4,740,000
CONNEAUT HARBOR	665,000	665,000
DEER CREEK LAKE	740,000	740,000
DELAWARE LAKE	510,000	510,000
DILLON LAKE	485,000	485,000
FAIRPORT HARBOR	655,000	655,000
HURON HARBOR	915,000	915,000
LORAIN HARBOR	1,240,000	1,240,000
MASSILLON	15,000	15,000
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN DAM & RESERVOIR	605,000	605,000
MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE	643,000	643,000
MUSKINGUM RIVER RESERVOIRS	3,635,000	3,635,000
NEWARK	15,000	15,000
NORTH BRANCH OF KOKOSING RIVER LAKE	135,000	135,000
PAINT CREEK LAKE	665,000	665,000
ROSEVILLE	15,000	15,000
SANDUSKY HARBOR	745,000	745,000
TOLEDO HARBOR	3,580,000	3,580,000
TOM JENKINS DAM	265,000	265,000
WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE	309,000	309,000
WILLIAM H. HARSHA LAKE	481,000	481,000
OKLAHOMA		
BIRCH LAKE	559,000	559,000
BROKEN BOW LAKE	1,043,000	1,043,000
CANTON LAKE	879,000	879,000
COPAN LAKE	407,000	407,000
EUFAULA LAKE	2,680,000	2,680,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
FORT SUPPLY LAKE	561,000	561,000
FORT GIBSON LAKE	2,703,000	2,703,000
GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE	309,000	309,000
HEYBURN LAKE	425,000	425,000
HUGO LAKE	842,000	842,000
HULAH LAKE	737,000	737,000
KAW LAKE	1,126,000	1,126,000
KEYSTONE LAKE	2,414,000	2,414,000
OOLOGAH LAKE	1,107,000	1,107,000
OPTIMA LAKE	537,000	537,000
PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES	36,000	36,000
PINE CREEK LAKE	607,000	607,000
ROBERT S. KERR LOCK, DAM & RESERVOIR	2,110,000	2,110,000
SARDIS LAKE	440,000	440,000
TENKILLER FERRY LAKE	2,490,000	2,490,000
WAURIKA LAKE	711,000	711,000
WEBBERS FALLS LOCK & DAM	2,061,000	2,061,000
WISTER LAKE	537,000	537,000
OREGON		
APPLEGATE LAKE	506,000	506,000
BLUE RIVER LAKE	157,000	157,000
BONNEVILLE LOCK & DAM	10,365,000	10,365,000
CHETCO RIVER	383,000	383,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA	6,547,000	6,547,000
COOS BAY	2,283,000	2,283,000
COOS & MILLICOMA RIVERS	148,000	148,000
COQUILLE RIVER	431,000	431,000
COTTAGE GROVE LAKE	655,000	655,000
COUGAR LAKE	1,037,000	1,037,000
DEPOE BAY	128,000	128,000
DETROIT LAKE	1,407,000	1,407,000
DORENA LAKE	500,000	500,000
FALL CREEK LAKE	295,000	295,000
FERN RIDGE DAM & LAKE	678,000	678,000
GREEN PETER-FOSTER LAKES	1,685,000	1,685,000
HILLS CREEK LAKE	630,000	630,000
JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, LAKE UMATILLA, OR & WA	9,999,000	9,999,000
LOOKOUT POINT LAKE	2,426,000	2,426,000
LOST CREEK LAKE	2,700,000	2,700,000
MCNARY LOCK & DAM, LAKE WALLULA, OR & WA	11,240,000	11,240,000
PORT ORFORD	163,000	163,000
ROGUE RIVER HARBOR AT GOLD BEACH	503,000	503,000
SIUSLAW RIVER	1,372,000	1,372,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
SKIPANON CHANNEL	430,000	430,000
TILLAMOOK BAY & BAR	218,000	218,000
UMPQUA RIVER	770,000	770,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN BANK PROTECTION	45,000	45,000
WILLOW CREEK LAKE	95,000	95,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS	423,000	423,000
WILLAMETTE RIVER ABOVE PORTLAND & YAMHILL RIVER	6,000	6,000
YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR	1,175,000	1,175,000
YAQUINA RIVER	755,000	755,000
PENNSYLVANIA		
ALLEGHENY RIVER	3,274,000	3,274,000
ALVIN R. BUSH DAM	296,000	296,000
AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE	112,000	112,000
BELTZVILLE LAKE	368,000	368,000
BLUE MARSH LAKE	989,000	989,000
CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE	716,000	716,000
COWANESQUE LAKE	608,000	608,000
CROOKED CREEK LAKE	1,290,000	1,290,000
CURWENSVILLE LAKE	408,000	408,000
EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE	666,000	666,000
ERIE HARBOR	635,000	635,000
FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM & RESERVOIR	463,000	463,000
FRANCIS E. WALTER DAM	346,000	346,000
GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM & RESERVOIR	102,000	102,000
JOHNSTOWN	21,000	21,000
KINZUA DAM & ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA & NY	1,107,000	1,107,000
LOYALHANNA LAKE	1,138,000	1,138,000
MAHONING CREEK LAKE	534,000	534,000
MONONGAHELA-YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER BASIN, PA, WV & MD	10,574,000	10,574,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS & DAMS	8,303,000	8,303,000
PROMPTON LAKE	181,000	181,000
PUNXSUTAWNEY	7,000	7,000
RAYSTOWN LAKE	1,615,000	1,615,000
SCHUYLKILL RIVER	1,721,000	1,721,000
SHENANGO RIVER LAKE	1,281,000	1,281,000
STILLWATER LAKE	173,000	173,000
TIOGA - HAMMOND LAKES	942,000	942,000
TIONESTA LAKE	958,000	958,000
UNION CITY LAKE	545,000	545,000
WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE	836,000	836,000
YORK, INDIAN ROCK DAM	335,000	335,000
YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE	1,440,000	1,440,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
SOUTH CAROLINA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY (CHARLESTON DISTRICT)	2,250,000	2,250,000
CHARLESTON HARBOR	5,950,000	5,950,000
COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR	250,000	250,000
FOLLY RIVER	130,000	130,000
GEORGETOWN HARBOR	2,600,000	2,600,000
LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC	1,200,000	1,200,000
MURRELLS INLET	230,000	230,000
SHIPYARD RIVER	600,000	600,000
SOUTH DAKOTA		
BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE	3,515,000	3,515,000
COLD BROOK LAKE	142,000	142,000
COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE	141,000	141,000
FORT RANDALL DAM, LAKE FRANCIS CASE	6,689,000	6,689,000
LAKE TRAVERSE AND BOIS DE SIOUX, SD & MN	194,000	194,000
OAHE DAM, LAKE OAHE, SD & ND	5,488,000	5,488,000
TENNESSEE		
CENTER HILL LAKE	2,747,000	2,747,000
CHEATHAM LOCK & DAM	2,299,000	2,299,000
CORDELL HULL DAM & RESERVOIR	2,327,000	2,327,000
DALE HOLLOW LAKE	2,084,000	2,084,000
J. PERCY PRIEST DAM & RESERVOIR	1,726,000	1,726,000
OLD HICKORY LOCK & DAM	4,453,000	4,453,000
TENNESSEE RIVER	5,013,000	5,013,000
WOLF RIVER HARBOR	530,000	530,000
TEXAS		
AQUILLA LAKE	516,000	516,000
ARKANSAS-RED RIVER BASINS CHLORIDE CONTROL (AREA 8)	263,000	263,000
BARDWELL LAKE	498,000	498,000
BELTON LAKE	1,123,000	1,123,000
BENBROOK LAKE	704,000	704,000
BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR	20,000	20,000
BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES	807,000	807,000
CANYON LAKE	638,000	638,000
CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL (1968 ACT)	4,746,000	4,746,000
DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX & OK	5,191,000	5,191,000
FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O' THE PINES	1,259,000	1,259,000
FREEPORT HARBOR	3,299,000	3,299,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
GALVESTON HARBOR & CHANNEL	3,978,000	3,978,000
GRANGER LAKE	495,000	495,000
GRAPEVINE LAKE	1,550,000	1,550,000
GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	13,993,000	13,993,000
HORDS CREEK LAKE	687,000	687,000
HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL	12,962,000	12,962,000
LAKE KEMP	336,000	336,000
LAVON LAKE	1,598,000	1,598,000
LEWISVILLE DAM	2,915,000	2,915,000
MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL	1,007,000	1,007,000
NAVARRO MILLS LAKE	807,000	807,000
NORTH SAN GABRIEL LAKE	523,000	523,000
O. C. FISHER DAM & LAKE	500,000	500,000
PAT MAYSE LAKE	507,000	507,000
PROCTOR LAKE	763,000	763,000
SABINE-NECHES WATERWAY	9,922,000	9,922,000
SAM RAYBURN DAM & RESERVOIR	2,257,000	2,257,000
SOMERVILLE LAKE	866,000	866,000
STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM	672,000	672,000
TEXAS CITY CHANNEL	2,350,000	2,350,000
TOWN BLUFF DAM & B.A. STEINHAGEN LAKE	688,000	688,000
TRINITY RIVER & TRIBS-CHANNEL TO LIBERTY	7,000	7,000
WACO LAKE	1,297,000	1,297,000
WALLISVILLE PROJECT - TRINITY RIVER	65,000	65,000
WHITNEY LAKE	1,136,000	1,136,000
WRIGHT PATMAN DAM & LAKE	893,000	893,000
VERMONT		
BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE	369,000	369,000
NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE	300,000	300,000
NORTH HARTLAND LAKE	366,000	366,000
TOWNSHEND LAKE	396,000	396,000
UNION VILLAGE DAM	275,000	275,000
VIRGINIA		
ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY	1,399,000	1,399,000
CHINCOTEAGUE INLET	907,000	907,000
GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW	877,000	877,000
HAMPTON ROADS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEW HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL)	180,000	180,000
JAMES RIVER	3,049,000	3,049,000
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN DAM & RESERVOIR	630,000	630,000
JOHN H. KERR DAM & RESERVOIR, VA & NC	4,003,000	4,003,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
NORFOLK HARBOR	7,278,000	7,278,000
NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)	256,000	256,000
NORTH FORK OF POUND LAKE	445,000	445,000
PHILPOTT LAKE	1,354,000	1,354,000
WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA	147,000	147,000
WASHINGTON		
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM	4,975,000	4,975,000
COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY	127,000	127,000
COLUMBIA AND LWR WILLAMETTE RIVS BELOW VANCVR & PORT, OR & WA	11,858,000	21,178,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA & THE DALLES	701,000	701,000
COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN CHINOOK & SAND IS, WA & OR	249,000	249,000
EVERETT HARBOR & SNOHOMISH RIVER	850,000	850,000
GRAYS HARBOR & CHEHALIS RIVER	3,755,000	3,755,000
HOWARD A. HANSON RESERVOIR	407,000	407,000
ICE HARBOR LOCK & DAM	4,021,000	4,021,000
LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL	2,478,000	2,478,000
LITTLE GOOSE LOCK & DAM, LAKE BRYAN	4,027,000	4,027,000
LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA & ID	5,078,000	5,078,000
LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK & DAM	3,233,000	3,233,000
MILL CREEK LAKE	365,000	365,000
MUD MOUNTAIN DAM	800,000	800,000
PT TOWNSEND BOAT BASIN & WW CONNECT PT TOWNSEND & OAK BAY	240,000	240,000
PUGET SOUND & ITS TRIBUTARY WATERS	658,000	658,000
QUILLAYUTE RIVER	380,000	380,000
SEATTLE HARBOR	715,000	715,000
STILLAGUMISH RIVER	100,000	100,000
SWINOMISH CHANNEL	330,000	330,000
TACOMA - PUYALLUP RIVER	60,000	60,000
THE DALLES LOCK & DAM, LAKE CELILO, WA & OR	8,110,000	8,110,000
WILLAPA RIVER & HARBOR & NASELLE RIVER	186,000	186,000
WYNOOCHEE LAKE	732,000	732,000
WEST VIRGINIA		
BEECH FORK LAKE	595,000	595,000
BLUESTONE LAKE	898,000	898,000
BURNSVILLE LAKE	760,000	760,000
EAST LYNN LAKE	810,000	810,000
ELKINS	6,000	6,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
KANAWHA RIVER	5,631,000	5,631,000
OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS	9,821,000	9,821,000
R. D. BAILEY LAKE	885,000	885,000
SUMMERSVILLE LAKE	1,043,000	1,043,000
SUTTON LAKE	1,118,000	1,118,000
TYGART LAKE	754,000	754,000
WISCONSIN		
ASHLAND HARBOR	423,000	423,000
EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE	311,000	311,000
FOX RIVER	826,000	826,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR	1,160,000	1,160,000
GREEN BAY HARBOR (DIKED DISPOSAL)	81,000	81,000
KENOSHA HARBOR	173,000	173,000
KEWAUNEE HARBOR	519,000	519,000
LAFARGE LAKE	21,000	21,000
MANITOWAC HARBOR	419,000	419,000
MILWAUKEE HARBOR	553,000	553,000
OCONTO HARBOR	21,000	21,000
PORT WING HARBOR	19,000	19,000
PORT WASHINGTON	378,000	378,000
RACINE HARBOR	71,000	71,000
SHEBOYGAN RIVER	181,000	181,000
STURGEON BAY (DIKED DISPOSAL)	7,000	7,000
STURGEON BAY	57,000	57,000
TWO RIVERS HARBOR	27,000	27,000
MISCELLANEOUS		
ENVIRONMENTAL AND WATER QUALITY OPERATIONAL STUDIES	3,385,000	3,385,000
INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS	6,296,000	6,296,000
SCHEDULING FLOOD CONTROL RESERVOIR OPERATIONS	2,042,000	2,042,000
MONITOR COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS	900,000	900,000
RIVER ICE MANAGEMENT	1,500,000	1,500,000
REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION RESEARCH (REMR)	910,000	910,000
PROTECTION OF NAVIGATION		
REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS AND OBSTRUCTIONS	2,130,000	2,130,000
PROTECTION, CLEARING AND STRAIGHTENING CHANNELS (SECTION 3)	100,000	100,000
GENERAL REGULATORY FUNCTIONS	49,500,000	49,500,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Budget estimate (2)	Allowance (3)
PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS	6,214,000	6,214,000
SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS	1,850,000	1,850,000
MOBILIZATION PLANNING	5,000,000	5,000,000
TOTAL	1,161,300,000	1,170,620,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:

(N) NAVIGATION
(FC) FLOOD CONTROL
(MP) MULTIPLE-PURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

REVOLVING FUND

Appropriations, 1983	
Budget estimate, 1984	
House allowance	$9,500,000
Committee recommendation	
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	−9,500,000

The Committee does not concur and has deleted, without prejudice, the Corps of Engineers learning facility added by the House. The Committee has had no hearings on this item and believes that additional information is needed before making a recommendation on this project.

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

Appropriations, 1983	$29,877,000
Budget estimate, 1984	10,000,000
House allowance	10,000,000
Committee recommendation	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,000,000 for flood control and coastal emergencies.

The funds recommended provide for advance preparation measures associated with flood emergencies, flood fighting and rescue operations, and other emergency work.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriations 1983	$96,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	103,000,000
House allowance	103,000,000
Committee recommendation	103,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	....
House allowance	....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $103,000,000, the same as the House allowance and budget request.

This appropriation finances the expenses of the Office, Chief of Engineers, the division offices, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and certain research and statistical functions of the Corps of Engineers.

Also included in this appropriation is $70,000, an increase of $25,000, to finance the activities of the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses (PIANC), the worldwide association of governmental navigation personnel and participants. The U.S. Government has been authorized by Congress since 1903 to participate in the activities of PIANC. The amount provided for this activity has not been increased for several years.

SPECIAL RECREATION USE FEES

Appropriations, 1983	$4,942,000
Budget estimate, 1984	6,000,000
House allowance	6,000,000
Committee recommendation	6,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	....
House allowance	....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $6,000,000.

The Special Recreation Use Fee revenues authorized under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Amendment Act of 1972 will be used for authorized recreation purposes at over 160 Corps of Engineers water resource projects which include fee collecting, recreation facility development, and items essential to the health and safety of the using public.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1983	$32,474,000
Budget estimate, 1984	31,831,000
House allowance	34,431,000
Committee recommendation	31,981,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+150,000
House allowance	−2,450,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $31,981,000, which is $150,000 over the budget request and $2,450,000 below the House allowance.

LaVerkin Springs study, Utah.—The Committee is aware of the cooperation and progress that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Washington County Conservancy District have made thus far on the LaVerkin Springs study. Given this record and the local water district's willingness to contribute $230,000 to accelerated studies, the Committee directs the Bureau to spend up to $270,000 in fiscal year 1984 for studies to be combined with the local contribution. The Committee recognizes that the local contribution will represent a net savings to the Government of $230,000 in fiscal year 1985, and accordingly urges the Bureau to move expeditiously with the study effort in 1984.

Last year the Committee concurred with the House in providing $650,000 to continue HIPLEX-related research and aircraft operations in 1983. The Committee is concerned that the Bureau of Reclamation has failed to allocate these funds in fiscal year 1983. The Committee has again provided an additional $650,000 and directs the Bureau to allocate such amounts to: (1) preserve the key scientific and contract personnel and equipment; (2) continue the minimum ongoing cloud seeding experiments and research; (3) continue aircraft operations for "on top" seeding delivery; and (4) continue the downwind affects research, and apply the HIPLEX results.

The recommended amounts provided under this heading for surveys and activities are shown in the following table:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ARIZONA				
LOWER COLORADO RIVER WATER CONSV.&EFFICIENT USE PROG.	SP.INV.	400,000	400,000	400,000
CALIFORNIA				
ALL AMERICAN CANAL RELOCATION	PRJ.IN.	135,000	135,000	135,000
CENTRAL VALLEY:				
DELTA DIVISION, KELLOGG UNIT REFORMULATION	PRJ.IN.	353,000	353,000	353,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT STUDY	SP.INV.	350,000	350,000	350,000
NEW MELONES CONVEYANCE SYSTEM	PRJ.IN.-I	150,000	150,000	150,000
SHASTA DAM ENLARGEMENT	PRJ.IN.-I	---	1,850,000	---
SAN JOAQUIN CONVEYANCE	PRJ.IN.-I	---	300,000	---
SANTA MARGARITA	PRJ.IN.	180,000	180,000	180,000
LOWER COLORADO WATER SUPPLY STUDY	PRJ.IN.	150,000	150,000	150,000
COLORADO				
PROGRAM RELATED ENGINEERING AND SCIENTIFIC STUDIES		4,765,000	4,765,000	4,765,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IDAHO				
BOISE PROJECT POWER AND MODIFICATION STUDY............	PRJ.IN.-P	300,000	300,000	300,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT,NORTH SIDE PUMPING DIVISION EXTEN....	PRJ.IN.-P	225,000	225,000	225,000
PALISADES PROJECT, PALISADES POWERPLANT ENLARGEMENT...	AD.PLN.-P	50,000	50,000	50,000
MONTANA				
CROW CREEK INDIAN RESERVATION AREA....................	PRJ.IN.	150,000	150,000	150,000
HUNGRY HORSE POWERPLANT ENLARGE.& REREGULATING RESV...	PRJ.IN.-P	145,000	145,000	145,000
MARIAS-MILK PROJECT..................................	AD.PLN.	150,000	150,000	150,000
NEBRASKA				
PLATTE RIVER WATER USE OPTIONS........................	SP.INV.	150,000	150,000	150,000
PRAIRIE BEND UNIT (P-SMBP)...........................	PRJ.IN.	250,000	250,000	250,000
REPUBLICAN RIVER BASIN WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY(P-SMBP).	SP.INV.	130,000	130,000	130,000
NEVADA				
DEEP-CARBONATE AQUIFER INVESTIGATION..................	SP.INV.	30,000	30,000	30,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
NEW MEXICO				
LAKE MEREDITH SALINITY CONTROL........................	PRJ.IN.	300,000	300,000	300,000
OREGON				
FARMERS IRRIGATION DISTRICT...........................	SP.INV.	215,000	215,000	215,000
SILITZ BASIN..		---	---	200,000
ROGUE RIVER BASIN, GRANTS PASS DIVISION...............	PRJ.IN.-I	5,000	5,000	5,000
UMATILLA BASIN..	PRJ.IN.-I	260,000	260,000	260,000
UPPER JOHN DAY..	PRJ.IN.-I	150,000	150,000	---
SOUTH DAKOTA				
LAKE ANDES-WAGNER UNIT................................	AD.PLN.	150,000	150,000	300,000
CENTRAL SOUTH DAKOTA WATER STUDIES (P-SMBP)...........	PRJ.IN.-I	450,000	450,000	450,000
RAPID CITY WATER SUPPLY...............................	PRJ.IN.-M&I	75,000	75,000	75,000
SOUTH DAKOTA WATER DELIVERIES STUDY (P-SMBP)..........	PRJ.IN.-M&I	400,000	400,000	400,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
TEXAS				
AMERICAN CANAL EXTENSION, RIO GRANDE PROJECT..........	AD.PLN.	---	450,000	---
TEXAS BASIN, BEDIAS RESERVOIR.........................	PRJ.IN.	150,000	150,000	150,000
TEXAS BASIN, BIG SANDY................................	PRJ.IN.	150,000	150,000	150,000
TEXAS BASIN, BON WEIR.................................	PRJ.IN.-M&I	70,000	70,000	70,000
TEXAS BASIN, COLUMBUS BEND M&I WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	PRJ.IN.-M&I	350,000	350,000	350,000
TEXAS BASIN, SAN JACINTO RIVER BASIN..................	PRJ.IN.	150,000	150,000	150,000
UTAH				
CRSP POWER PEAKING CAPACITY...........................	PRJ.IN.-P	660,000	660,000	660,000
WASATCH FRONT TOTAL WATER MANAGEMENT..................	SP.INV.	450,000	450,000	450,000
WASHINGTON				
YAKIMA, CLE ELUM AND TIETON POWERPLANTS	PRJ.IN.-P	80,000	80,000	80,000
YAKIMA RIVER BASIN WATER ENHANCEMENT..................	PRJ.IN.-I	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1983	$640,570,000
Budget estimate, 1984	699,388,000
House allowance	711,538,000
Committee recommendation	683,818,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−15,570,000
House allowance	−27,720,000

A new appropriation of $683,818,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is $27,720,000 below the House allowance and $15,570,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 1984.

Central Arizona Project.—The Committee has deleted from the bill language which appropriates $15,000,000 for the Tucson Division of the Central Arizona project. Given the complexity and magnitude of the CAP, the Committee feels that it is not wise or prudent to tie up these funds by law. However, the Committee reaffirms its strong support and the position taken in action on the Emergency Jobs Bill, and directs the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation to proceed with construction of the Tucson aqueduct, including excavation and construction of the Picacho, Red Rock, and Brady pumping plants, purchase of pumps and motors for those plants, and acquisition of rights-of-way and construction of reaches 1, 2, and 3 of phase A of the aqueduct.

Garrison Diversion Unit, North Dakota.—The Committee has included the full budget request of $22,330,000 for continued work on the Garrison Diversion Unit, N. Dak. The Committee continues to recognize the value of this project and strongly supports completion of the unit. To allay concerns about the impact of the project on Canada, the Committee has included language in the bill which prohibits funding for any project features affecting waters flowing into Canada.

O'Neill Unit, Nebr.—The Committee has deleted funds contained in the budget for the O'Neill Unit in Nebraska. Because of ongoing litigation, there is no present requirement for funding. The Committee believes that if the Bureau of Reclamation should incur any cost in resolving litigation issues that available funds be used to pay for those costs.

Yuma, Ariz., Quartermaster Depot.—The Committee is aware of the efforts of the citizens of Yuma, Ariz., to preserve the historic site, the Quartermaster Depot, which is occupied by the Yuma Water Users' Association through a contract with the Bureau of Reclamation. In order that the integrity of this historic site may be preserved and open to the public, the Committee directs the Commissioner to make available a sum of $1,500,000 for the relocation of the Yuma Water Users' and construction of comparable quarters for their operation of the Yuma Reclamation Project.

The amount recommended by the Committee is shown on the following table along with the budget request and House allowance:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
WYOMING				
BLUE HOLES RESERVOIR	PRJ.IN.	100,000	100,000	100,000
GUERNSEY DAM POWERPLANT ENLARGEMENT	PRJ.IN.-P	60,000	60,000	60,000
NORTH PLATTE RIVER HYDROELECTRIC STUDY (P-SMBP)	PRJ.IN.-P	195,000	195,000	195,000
WIND HYDROELECTRIC ENERGY PROJECT	PRJ.IN.-P	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
VARIOUS				
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	PRJ.IN.	4,410,000	4,410,000	4,410,000
CRWQIP, LOWER GUNNISON WATER SYSTEMS	AD.PLN.	530,000	530,000	530,000
GENERAL ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH:				
ATMOSPHERIC WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PROGRAM		4,715,000	4,715,000	5,365,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES		420,000	420,000	420,000
NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH		470,000	470,000	470,000
SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS:				
ENVIRONMENTAL AND INTERAGENCY COORD. ACTIVITIES	SP.INV.	3,165,000	3,165,000	3,165,000
INVESTIGATIONS OF EXISTING PROJECTS	SP.INV.	672,000	672,000	672,000
MINOR WORK IN CONNECTION WITH COMPLETED PROJ.INVEST.	SP.INV.	460,000	460,000	460,000

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Type of project (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
PRINT REPORTS	SP.INV.	35,000	35,000	35,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES	SP.INV.	1,550,000	1,550,000	1,550,000
PROJECTS NOT YET IDENTIFIED	SP.INV.	35,000	35,000	35,000
PAY RAISE ALLOWANCE		661,000	661,000	661,000
GENERAL REDUCTION DUE TO SLIPPAGE, SAVINGS AND CARRYOVER BALANCES		---	---	-700,000
TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		31,831,000	34,431,000	31,981,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION					
ARIZONA					
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT (BIA).............	53,000,000	---	11,000,000	---	---
CALIFORNIA					
CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:					
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION...........................	327,921,000	278,236,000	12,300,000	12,300,000	12,300,000
SAN LUIS UNIT.......................................	1,142,310,000	473,026,000	3,103,000	4,103,000	3,103,000
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT:					
AUBURN AREA FACILITIES............................	1,654,714,000	223,110,000	2,250,000	2,250,000	2,250,000
ALL OTHER AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT FACILITIES.....	369,749,000	104,698,000	705,000	705,000	705,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS......................	853,903,000	846,517,000	2,645,000	2,645,000	2,645,000
SAN FELIPE DIVISION.................................	357,404,000	141,048,000	72,360,000	72,360,000	72,360,000
TRINITY RIVER DIV, GRASS VALLEY CREEK DEBRIS DAM....	750,000	---	---	450,000	---
COLORADO					
FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT............................	484,159,000	463,192,000	6,863,000	8,063,000	6,863,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION........	76,249,000	12,048,000	15,155,000	15,155,000	15,155,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
NEW MEXICO					
BRANTLEY PROJECT....................................	229,531,000	13,927,000	12,694,000	12,694,000	12,694,000
VELARDE, N. MEX. WATER DIVERSION SYS. REPAIR..........	---	---	---	---	6,000,000
OKLAHOMA					
MCGEE CREEK PROJECT.................................	131,016,000	53,797,000	40,610,000	50,610,000	40,610,000
TEXAS					
NUECES RIVER PROJECT................................	87,669,000	77,036,000	8,103,000	8,103,000	8,103,000
WASHINGTON					
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, OROVILLE-TONASKET UNIT......	71,065,000	34,263,000	13,430,000	13,430,000	13,430,000
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT:					
IRRIGATION FACILITIES...............................	3,309,896,000	880,845,000	17,170,000	17,170,000	17,170,000
THIRD POWERPLANT....................................	695,000,000	601,887,000	38,590,000	38,590,000	38,590,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM					
NEBRASKA					
NORTH LOUP DIVISION....................................	262,115,000	79,728,000	32,420,000	32,420,000	32,420,000
O'NEILL UNIT...	367,050,000	6,439,000	1,570,000	---	---
NORTH DAKOTA					
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT................................	1,110,700,000	168,715,000	22,330,000	---	22,330,000
SOUTH DAKOTA					
WEB RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT..........................	96,000,000	3,900,000	---	2,000,000	4,000,000
WYOMING					
BUFFALO BILL DAM MODIFICATION..........................	62,000,000	1,050,000	3,000,000	---	---
RIVERTON UNIT..	45,880,000	34,600,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
VARIOUS					
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION					
BELLE FOURCHE PROJECT, SOUTH DAKOTA..................	2,919,000	2,119,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO..............	29,287,000	26,076,000	990,000	990,000	990,000
BUFFALO RAPIDS PROJECT, MONTANA......................	4,600,000	4,539,000	61,000	61,000	61,000
CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT,WHITESTONE COULEE UNIT, WA.	8,755,000	8,030,000	725,000	725,000	725,000
EDEN PROJECT, UTAH..................................	14,653,000	11,084,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
GILA PROJECT, ARIZONA...............................	78,295,000	73,694,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA..................	47,645,000	32,994,000	3,004,000	3,004,000	3,004,000
LITTLE WOOD RIVER PROJECT, IDAHO....................	2,466,000	2,195,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
MISCELLANEOUS ENGINEERING SERVICES..................	456,000	405,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA.....................	41,514,000	41,414,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TEXAS........................	71,394,000	71,294,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
RECREATION FACILITIES AT EXISTING RESERVOIRS,VAR....	1,428,000	803,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
SAN ANGELO PROJECT, TWIN BUTTES DAM, TEXAS..........	32,731,000	30,349,000	500,000	2,500,000	500,000
SOUTHERN NEVADA PROJECT, NEVADA.....................	170,639,000	169,702,000	937,000	937,000	937,000
TUALATIN PROJECT, OREGON............................	60,033,000	55,203,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000
WASHITA BASIN PROJECT, FOSS DAM, OKLAHOMA...........	34,250,000	31,718,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
WASHOE PROJECT, CALIFORNIA-NEVADA...................	348,696,000	36,160,000	1,818,000	1,818,000	1,818,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH...........................	98,198,000	94,661,000	350,000	350,000	350,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1983	$140,866,000
Budget estimate, 1984	134,091,000
House allowance	134,291,000
Committee recommendation	134,291,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+200,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $134,291,000, which is the same as the House allowance and $200,000 over the budget request.

Bascule Gate, Dickinson, N. Dak.—The Committee recognizes the many problems that have resulted from the Bureau of Reclamation's insistence that a bascule gate be installed at Dickinson, N. Dak. Further, the Committee is aware of the exhorbitant cost of operating and maintaining the gate, particularly since the gate has failed to operate properly, resulting in a significant loss of the city's municipal water supply. In addition, the Committee is concerned about liability for property damage and personal injury as a result of the gate malfunctioning. Therefore, the Committee directs the Bureau of Reclamation to absorb all costs relating to the operation of the bascule gate and to take the appropriate legal measures to relieve the city of Dickinson of all liability for property damage and personal injury which may result from the operation of the gate.

Trinity River dredging, California.—The Committee concurs with the $200,000 added by the House for Reclamation's share of expenses incurred by the State of California in dredging sections of the Trinity River. However, the Committee feels strongly that if the Bureau of Reclamation has an agreement to undertake such work, as stated in the House report, sufficient funds should be budgeted in future years to accomplish the work.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1983	$55,106,000
Budget estimate, 1984	41,500,000
House allowance	52,970,000
Committee recommendation	40,500,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−1,000,000
House allowance	−12,470,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $40,500,000. This is $12,470,000 below the House allowance and $1,000,000 below the budget request.

This appropriation provides for loans to non-Federal organizations for construction and rehabilitation of distribution systems and for loans and grants to construct small irrigation projects.

The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 was enacted for the purpose of encouraging local participation by qualified organizations in the development of small reclamation projects and to provide Federal assistance in the development of similar projects by non-Federal organizations.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
UNITS OR DIVISIONS, PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:					
EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA............................	24,230,000	22,904,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA............................	42,836,000	39,849,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA............................	490,000,000	41,867,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING............................	7,010,000	6,583,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
			--------------	--------------	--------------
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION.........			14,082,000	16,082,000	14,082,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:					
BOISE PROJECT, BLACK CANYON DAM, IDAHO..............	5,600,000	489,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, ISLAND PARK DAM, IDAHO............	5,091,000	2,691,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	1,900,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, JACKSON LAKE DAM, WYOMING.........	7,000,000	3,131,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, LAHONTAN DAM, NEVADA..............	6,764,000	3,352,000	3,412,000	3,412,000	3,412,000
NORTH PLATTE PROJECT, GUERNSEY DAM, WYOMING.........	2,240,000	50,000	2,190,000	2,190,000	2,190,000
ORLAND PROJECT, STONY GORGE DAM, CALIFORNIA.........	7,320,000	1,394,000	4,750,000	4,750,000	4,750,000
RAPID VALLEY PROJECT, DEERFIELD DAM, SOUTH DAKOTA...	5,879,000	5,573,000	306,000	306,000	306,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA.......	8,904,000	349,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
SUN RIVER PROJECT, GIBSON DAM, MONTANA..............	3,152,000	3,052,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
SUN RIVER PROJECT, WILLOW CREEK DAM, MONTANA........	620,000	320,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
DEPARTMENT DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.......................	4,510,000	1,010,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS AND PRECONSTRUCTION PLANNING...	38,567,000	8,663,000	3,585,000	3,585,000	3,585,000
			--------------	--------------	--------------
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS...........................			17,743,000	17,743,000	17,743,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:					
CARLSBAD PROJECT, NEW MEXICO........................	5,985,000	5,761,000	224,000	224,000	224,000
GRAND VALLEY PROJECT, ORCHARD MESA DIVISION, COLO..	2,816,000	2,468,000	348,000	348,000	348,000
HARLINGEN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, TEXAS................	3,000,000	--	800,000	800,000	800,000
MILK RIVER, GLASGOW DIVISION, MONTANA...............	2,300,000	--	110,000	110,000	110,000
NEWLANDS PROJECT, NEVADA............................	29,258,000	1,643,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
OKANOGAN PROJECT, OKANOGAN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA..	11,669,000	---	3,210,000	3,210,000	3,210,000
P-SMBP, FRENCHMAN-CAMBRIDGE DIVISION, NEBRASKA......	5,500,000	4,398,000	610,000	610,000	610,000
P-SMBP, HELENA VALLEY UNIT, MONTANA.................	2,200,000	10,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT,ROOSEVELT WTR. CONSV. DIST.,AR...	7,470,000	---	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, FRANNIE DIVISION, WYOMING.........	1,600,000	169,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, HEART MOUNTAIN DIVISION, WYOMING..	5,500,000	1,428,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT, WILLWOOD DIVISION, WYOMING........	1,600,000	1,450,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
STRAWBERRY VALLEY PROJECT, UTAH.....................	5,781,000	310,000	664,000	664,000	664,000
SUN RIVER PROJECT, FT. SHAW DIVISION, MONTANA.......	1,800,000	---	100,000	100,000	100,000
SUN RIVER PROJECT, GREENFIELDS DIVISION, MONTANA....	8,300,000	6,877,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
TUCUMCARI PROJECT, NEW MEXICO.......................	2,500,000	---	300,000	300,000	300,000
UNCOMPAHGRE PROJECT, COLORADO.......................	5,640,000	2,304,000	650,000	650,000	650,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, GRANDVIEW IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA...	1,265,000	5,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, GRANGER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA.....	1,330,000	5,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, OUTLOOK IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WA.....	2,956,000	100,000	1,361,000	1,361,000	1,361,000
YAKIMA PROJECT, SUNNYSIDE BOARD OF CONTROL, WA......	15,883,000	5,000	200,000	200,000	200,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
YAKINA PROJECT, SUNNYSIDE VALLEY IRRIGATION DIST, WA	15,936,000	5,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
YAKINA PROJECT, YAKINA-TIETON IRRIG. DIST.,WA.......	64,833,000	12,100,000	22,200,000	22,200,000	22,200,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT OF EXISTING PROJECTS..............................			35,727,000	35,727,000	35,727,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION..........			389,750,000	368,500,000	384,180,000
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT					
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND					
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS					
COLORADO					
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT..................................	106,653,000	60,652,000	16,200,000	16,200,000	16,200,000
DOLORES PROJECT......................................	383,746,000	144,666,000	37,200,000	37,200,000	37,200,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
UTAH					
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT..................	1,802,029,000	420,481,000	101,607,000	101,607,000	101,607,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, JENSEN UNIT......................	72,012,000	54,900,000	1,725,000	1,725,000	1,725,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT, (PRECON. PLANNING).	168,327,000	4,899,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UPALCO UNIT......................	90,463,000	6,811,000	2,015,000	2,015,000	2,015,000
VARIOUS					
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:					
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND:					
MODIFICATIONS & ADDITIONS TO COMPLETED FACILITIES.	17,621,000	10,941,000	1,056,000	1,056,000	1,056,000
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:					
LYMAN PROJECT, UTAH................................	32,529,000	32,278,000	251,000	251,000	251,000
SEEDSKADEE PROJECT, WYOMING........................	25,400,000	23,900,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:					
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES...............................	173,731,000	72,476,000	6,389,000	6,389,000	6,389,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES..........................	181,836,000	44,544,000	1,227,000	1,227,000	1,227,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT...........			168,720,000	168,720,000	168,720,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT					
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT					
ARIZONA					
CENTRAL ARIZONA-WATER DEVELOPMENT......................	2,602,241,000	1,082,428,000	155,600,000	179,000,000	160,600,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT,NON-INDIAN DISTR. SYSTEMS.....	221,300,000	2,499,000	10,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
TOTAL, CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT..................			165,600,000	199,000,000	180,600,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS					
TITLE II					
COLORADO					
GRAND VALLEY UNIT......................................	242,669,000	37,921,000	3,915,000	3,915,000	3,915,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT....................................	85,493,000	12,431,000	6,068,000	6,068,000	6,068,000

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
NEVADA					
LAS VEGAS WASH UNIT	106,092,000	4,235,000	1,075,000	1,075,000	1,075,000
VARIOUS					
TITLE I MEASURES BELOW IMPERIAL DAM	484,700,000	228,832,000	21,872,000	21,872,000	21,872,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS			32,930,000	32,930,000	32,930,000
PAY RAISE ALLOWANCE	---	---	5,388,000	5,388,000	5,388,000
GENERAL REDUCTION DUE TO SLIPPAGE, SAVINGS AND CARRYOVER BALANCES	---	---	-63,000,000	-63,000,000	-88,000,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM			699,388,000	711,538,000	683,818,000

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$39,928,000
Budget estimate, 1984	53,400,000
House allowance	53,750,000
Committee recommendation	53,400,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	....
House allowance	−350,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $53,400,000, which is the same as the budget request and $350,000 below the House allowance.

This appropriation finances the general administrative and technical direction of the reclamation program as performed by the Department, Denver regional and other offices in the seven regions.

The House included an additional $350,000 for the U.S. share of the cost of the Twelfth International Congress on Irrigation and Drainage. The Committee believes that this activity should be accommodated within budgeted resources.

GENERAL

The Committee is aware of several instances where informal assurances and commitments regarding additional funding over the President's request for studies or projects have been made by officials of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation. The Committee believes that such actions are inappropriate and should be discouraged. Procedures currently exist which allow the transfer of funds and any commitments should be accompanied by a request for additional funds.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Funds recommended in the bill provide for Department of Energy programs relating to energy supply, research, and development activities; uranium supply and enrichment activities; general science and research activities; atomic energy defense activities; departmental administration; power marketing activities; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the geothermal resources development fund.

ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$1,897,096,000
Budget estimate, 1984	1,855,960,000
House allowance	1,713,112,000
Committee recommendation	1,720,444,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−135,516,000
House allowance	+7,332,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1983	$352,976,000
Budget estimate, 1984	243,665,000
House allowance	251,097,000
Committee recommendation	233,265,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−10,400,000
House allowance	−17,832,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,943,709,000 for energy supply, research, and development activities. The purpose of these funds is to support the development of new energy technologies and improve the efficiency of existing technologies. Included are the development and demonstration of solar energy, wind, ocean systems, biomass, geothermal, nuclear fission and fusion, electric energy systems, and energy storage. Efforts associated with basic energy sciences and environmental research are also included.

SOLAR ENERGY

The administration has proposed again this year substantial reductions in funding for solar energy activities. In general, the Department's role in technology development would be focused on long-term research and development. Increased reliance is placed on private market forces and tax incentives rather than near-term demonstration and development.

The Committee agrees that the marketplace must ultimately decide the future role of the solar technologies. The Committee does not agree, however, that most solar and renewables research has been developed to the point where the private sector alone can be expected to carry forward with its development.

The Committee considers it essential that a viable solar and renewable energy research and development program be maintained in the Department of Energy and that the staff expertise be maintained to properly manage this type of effort. Continued basic research and development of solar and renewable energy is essential to maintain a balanced energy research program.

Accordingly, the Committee recommends restoration of program funds and staffing levels to carry out this basic research activity. The Committee recommendation for solar energy is $176,000,000, a reduction of $4,000,000 below the House allowance, and approximately $26,000,000 below the current level of funding.

Solar heat technologies.—The Committee recommends $55,550,000, which is $33,600,000 over the budget request and $3,150,000 below the House allowance. The budget request for this program includes activities previously funded under active systems, passive systems, and the solar thermal categories. To be consistent with the House allowance, the Committee divides these activities into two programs, solar building energy systems and solar thermal energy systems, each of which is discussed separately.

For solar building systems, the Committee provides $17,200,000, the same as the House and $8,925,000 over the budget request. The Committee believes that the breakdown in the House report for specific activities should be used only as a general guide by the Department.

For solar thermal energy systems, the Committee recommends a total of $38,500,000, which is $24,950,000 over the request and $3,000,000 below the House allowance. The Committee provides $10,000,000 for parabolic dish research and technology development which has received a strong endorsement from the DOE Energy Research Advisory Board. The Committee recommends an additional $4,500,000 for solar repowering design activities.

The Committee provides $4,000,000 for the second small community project and directs the Department to issue the program opportunity notice for this project within 90 days of the enactment of this act. The sum of $3,000,000 is provided from fiscal year 1983 deferred funds and an additional $1,000,000 shall be available from funds provided in this act. In addition, up to $1,000,000 is provided for salt gradient research.

Photovoltaic energy systems.—The recommendation provides $55,700,000 for photovoltaic energy systems, which is $9,000,000 over the House allowance and about $3,000,000 below the funding level in fiscal year 1983. This recommended funding will continue the highest priority requirements needed to continue progress in reducing costs and improving efficiencies of photovoltaic systems.

The Committee expects the Department to maintain a balanced program of advanced research, technology development, and systems development at SERI, JPL, and Sandia Laboratory. The Committee concurs with the House statement on the SMUD project.

Wind energy systems.—The recommendation includes $26,500,000 for wind energy, the same as the House. This is $17,900,000 over the budget request and $4,900,000 lower than the fiscal year 1983 amount.

The wind programs should continue to focus on the test and evaluation of small- and large-scale wind systems and on continuation of design for the MOD–5 machines.

The Committee notes that the administration has not made clear its plans for completing the MOD–2 program at Goodnoe Hills. The Committee intends for DOE to complete the MOD–2 program in an orderly and expeditious manner while maximizing the information obtained from this significant Government investment. Since operation of the MOD–2 machines is critical to achieving the goals of the large wind program, DOE should return these machines to operation as soon as possible.

The Committee agrees with the proposed House level of $16,000,000 for the MOD–5 design effort. However, the Department shall not be bound in any way by the funding allocation guidelines between the MOD–5A and MOD–5B as set forth in the House report.

No funds are provided for preparation of the next wind systems comprehensive program management plan without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

Biomass and alcohol fuels.—The recommendation includes $29,000,000 for biomass and alcohol fuels activities, the same as the House allowance and $11,700,000 more than the budget request. The recommendation adopts the new structure being proposed in the fiscal year 1984 request which combines alcohol fuels, biomass, and energy from municipal wastes into one budget category. The Committee feels that there is considerable research and development, not included in the proposed budget request, which should be undertaken in order to assure continued progress in these important renewable energy programs and to protect the research investment made to date.

In the area of biomass feedstock development research, the request of only $1,000,000 is inconsistent with the recommendations of the Energy Research Advisory Board, the Office of Technology Assessment, and the testimony of other professional groups. Accordingly, the Committee recommends $7,000,000 for this activity.

In conversion technology development, the Committee believes the budget request should place more emphasis on thermochemical conversion so as to provide a more balanced program with biochemical conversion activities.

The Committee provides $4,500,000 to continue the regional biomass energy programs, similar to the successful effort at the Bonneville Power Administration. In addition to providing support for activities at BPA and TVA, the Department shall establish and continue programs in other regions of the country. These regional programs would carry out activities related to technology transfer, industry support, resource assessment, and matching local resources to conversion technologies.

Ocean energy systems.—The Committee provides $8,000,000 for ocean energy systems, $1,000,000 over the House allowance and $8,000,000 above the budget request. The budget request again proposed to terminate the oceans energy systems program. The Committee recommends continuation of advanced research and technology development. An amount of $4,000,000 is included to identify and evaluate advanced thermal conversion concepts and develop open-cycle ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC) systems. For the Seacoast Test Facility in Hawaii, $2,000,000 is provided to operate and upgrade the facility and prepare for a 1 MW open-cycle test. Up to $1,500,000 is included for research into critical cold water pipe issues common to all ocean thermal technologies.

The Committee also provides $4,000,000 from the funds deferred in fiscal year 1983 for ocean thermal energy conversion systems.

Other solar programs.—The Committee recommends $11,100,000 for other solar energy activities, $1,000,000 less than the House and about $6,000,000 over the budget request.

Maintenance of a balanced and reasonable solar and renewables research program requires maintenance of an adequate staffing level. Consequently, the Committee recommendation provides $6,000,000 to maintain the average fiscal year 1983 staff levels for program management and support activities. A total of $1,000,000 is recommended for solar international activities. Additional program support funding is required for essential analyses and studies and $1,000,000 is recommended for this work. Technology transfer and solar information programs are recommended to be funded at $3,250,000, which is approximately the fiscal year 1983 level. The Department should continue the program administered by the Conservation and Renewable Energy Information Service.

GEOTHERMAL

The Committee believes that the budget request level for geothermal programs, which is over 75 percent lower than fiscal year 1983 levels, is ill-advised and will significantly slow research and the development of our geothermal resources. Accordingly, the recommendation provides $29,459,000 for geothermal activities, an increase of $15,906,000 over the budget request and $2,000,000 above the House allowance.

Hydrothermal industrialization.—The Committee includes $2,000,000 to continue a minimal effort in the hydrothermal area. These funds will assist States with significant hydrothermal resources to continue programs relating to resource assessment, resource development, technical assistance, and related activities.

Geopressured resources.—The recommendation includes $5,000,000 for geopressured resources, the same as the House, and an additional $5,000,000 over the budget request. This funding will be allocated to continue well testing in three design test wells in Louisiana and Texas.

Geothermal technology.—The Committee recommends $21,459,000 for geothermal technology activities, the same as the House allowance. An additional $2,500,000 is provided for continuation of efforts on phase II thermal loop at Fenton Hill, N. Mex.

The Committee has added $5,900,000 in the hydrothermal research activity for the Salton Sea scientific drilling project. The proposal is an "add-on" experiment to a proposed commercial geothermal well. By deepening this well from 12,000 to 18,000 feet, available data can be acquired at a relatively small incremental cost. The Committee concurs with the departmental use of available fiscal year 1983 funds of not to exceed $250,000 for this project.

HYDROPOWER

The Committee recommendation includes $750,000 for small-scale hydropower, the same as the House allowance.

ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE

The Committee recommends $44,200,000 for energy storage and electric energy systems, the same as the House and $17,298,000 over the request.

Electric energy systems.—A total of $18,500,000 is provided, the same as the House allowance. The recommendation includes $4,800,000, the current level of funding and $3,800,000 above the request, for continued development of the Hawaiian deep sea cable project. Funds are included for this project subject to the Buy America Act and under the condition that the estimated cost established in the existing contract shall not be exceeded except in the public interest due to unforseeable circumstances beyond the control of the contractor.

Energy storage systems.—An amount of $25,700,000 is included for energy storage, the same as the House allowance and the same as the fiscal year 1983 level of funding.

NUCLEAR FISSION

The Committee believes that nuclear fission remains an important option for meeting our electric energy requirements and for lessening the Nation's reliance on imported oil. The Committee continues to strongly support the nuclear fission program.

A total of $617,147,000 is provided for the nuclear fission reactor program, $236,025,000 below the budget request and $13,000,000 below the House allowance.

Converter reactor.—An amount of $92,170,000 is recommended for converter reactor activities, the same as the House and $34,000,000 more than the budget request.

For high temperature reactor technology, $34,000,000 is recommended, which is $9,000,000 more than the House allowance. The development of this technology has been supported in the past because of its potential to serve special market areas and its potential advantages over the current light water reactor systems. Although the administration proposes to terminate the program, the Committee believes that it is premature to close out this option at the present time without further research and development. In view of the need for a long and costly development program, however, the Committee believes it is important for the private sector and the administration to evidence a stronger commitment to the technology.

For light water reactor systems and Three Mile Island activities, a total of $52,000,000 is provided, the same as the budget request and $9,000,000 less than the House allowance.

For advanced reactor systems, the fiscal year 1984 budget request again proposes to transfer funding for reduced-enrichment research and test reactor (RERTR) program to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Committee considers this type of research to be a responsibility of the Department of Energy. Therefore, the funding request has been transferred from the State, Justice, Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee to the Energy and Water Development Subcommittee. The Committee recommends $4,980,000 for this activity, the same as the House and the budget request.

Commercial nuclear waste.—The Committee recommends $22,580,000 for the commercial nuclear waste research activities, the same as the House and the budget request. Most of the nuclear waste program has been shifted to the new Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund. This fund is intended to provide additional funding for waste disposal activities to be financed from fees paid by electric utilities which generate nuclear power.

Also included in the Committee recommendation is $800,000 in capital equipment for the subsea bed waste disposal program.

Remedial action.—A total of $95,985,000 is recommended for remedial action, the same as the House and $5,000,000 over the budget request.

For remedial action at inactive uranium mill tailing sites, the Committee includes $27,900,000, the same as the budget request and the House allowance. This funding will allow continuation of important ongoing remedial action activities.

Once again, the Committee calls attention to a problem potentially affecting residents in the vicinity of Edgemont, S. Dak., due to uranium mill tailings placed as fill material off-site of the TVA-owned mill. Having been assigned responsibility for remedial action at designated vicinity properties, the Department of Energy is in the process of negotiating with the State of South Dakota a cooperative agreement and finalizing its review of the radiation monitoring and engineering assessment program conducted by the NRC.

Although the Committee directed DOE to complete the necessary remedial work during the 1983 construction season, it appears that preliminary requirements mandated by the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation and Control Act of 1978 may preclude the Department from completing the Edgemont off-site project this year.

If unable to complete this project during the current fiscal year, the Committee directs the Department to complete off-site remedial action at Edgemont during the 1984 construction season. Therefore, of the funds appropriated for title I sites, up to $1,000,000 should be made available in fiscal year 1984 to cover the cost of this project in accordance with the provisions of section 21 of Public Law 97–415, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Authorization for Fiscal Years 1982–83.

The Committee provides an additional $5,000,000 to initiate necessary remedial action activities for the site in Wayne/Pequanak, N.J.; for the site in Maywood, N.J. and vicinity residences; and for the Colonie, N.Y. site.

Nuclear fuel cycle.—The Committee recommends $41,807,000 for nuclear fuel cycle activities, the same as the House and the budget request. Within the funds provided, $3,000,000 is included for thorium fuel cycle research in support of the high temperature gas reactor technology.

Advanced nuclear systems.—The Committee includes $32,735,000 for space and terrestrial applications, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

Breeder reactor systems.—A total of $342,500,000 is included for breeder reactor systems research and development activities, $10,000,000 over the budget request and $2,000,000 above the House allowance. This amount excludes the Clinch River Breeder Reactor demonstration project which is discussed below.

For the liquid metal fast breeder reactor program, the Committee recommends $296,800,000, which is $10,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee supports the Department's effort to refocus and consolidate the LMFBR base program. Within the necessary budget constraints, it is important that the resources available to the base program be used in the most efficient and effective manner. The Department is expected to continue to streamline the program structure in such a way as to minimize disruption of ongoing activities.

The Committee directs DOE to continue to perform at Argonne National Lab, the program objectives established in fiscal year 1983. The additional $10,000,000 is provided for this purpose; $8,000,000 for operating expenses and $2,000,000 for the TREAT Upgarde Facility capital equipment. Argonne should also perform design studies of special purpose safety test facilities aimed at establishing optimum safety features to assure licensability for new breeder designs emphasizing inherent safety and low cost. The Department must provide a sufficient level of budget authority so that no program discontinuities occur.

Clinch River Breeder Reactor.—The Committee recommendation provides no funds in fiscal year 1984 for the Clinch River Breeder Reactor demonstration project. In Conference Report 97–980, which accompanied the fiscal year 1983 continuing appropriations bill, Congress prohibited the initiation of construction on any permanent structures or the purchase of any major equipment for the project. Also, Congress provided up to $1,000,000 for the Department "to vigorously explore proposals, including a reconsideration of the original cost-sharing arrangement, that would reduce Federal budget requirements for the Clinch River project or project alternative, and secure greater participation from the private sector." While the Committee has supported this project in the past, the absence of a viable and substantive alternative to reduce Federal appropriations requirements makes it impossible for the Committee to recommend funding at this time. Accordingly, the Committee is defering this matter without prejudice. If an alternative financing arrangement can be worked out among the interested parties, the Committee would consider a request for appropriations in fiscal year 1984 to continue the project. Until an alternative financing arrangement is enacted, however, no funds should be obligated or expended for additional major equipment orders or construction on any permanent structures or facilities.

ENVIRONMENT

The Committee is concerned that the budget request for environmental research activities has been reduced too drastically from fiscal year 1983 levels. The recommendation provides $222,575,000, an increase of $12,000,000 over the budget request and $7,000,000 less than the House allowance. This level of funding is about a $5,000,000 increase in operating expenses over the fiscal year 1983 program.

Biological and environmental research.—The Committee provides $180,600,000 for the highest priority research efforts in the biological and environmental area, an increase of $14,000,000 over the request and $7,000,000 below the House.

For nuclear safety activities, the $2,000,000 reduction proposed by the House is restored to support the Department's efforts to strengthen nuclear safety programs.

MAGNETIC FUSION

The Committee recommends $471,500,000 for magnetic fusion, $4,500,000 over the budget request and $1,500,000 below the House allowance. From the total recommendation, $392,700,000 is included for operating expenses as requested in the budget. This is $24,100,000 over the fiscal year 1983 level.

Significant progress has been made in establishing the scientific feasibility of magnetic fusion energy. Reactor level plasma temperatures and near reactor level confinement times have been achieved. The Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor was completed and began operation in fiscal year 1983 and should provide the first major demonstration of scientific breakeven in 1986.

Up to $6,000,000 is provided for the Advanced Toroidal Facility (ATF), which will provide a credible backup and support for the mainline Tokamak program in the area of physics and reactor concept improvement. This effort should proceed only with the benefit of involvement by the University of Wisconsin.

For applied plasma physics, an additional $3,500,000 is included to support slow source development for compact toroid experiments.

For development and technology, an increase of $1,000,000 is included for fusion systems engineering activities, particularly on first wall systems.

To date, basic research in the fields of nuclear fission and fusion has largely overlooked the potential for aneutronic nuclear alternatives using light metals such as lithium, which produce no radioactive side-effects. The Committee recommends the Department give higher priority to this nonradioactive and nonproliferation nuclear potential. The Department should allocate funds necessary to conduct a feasibility study to test the conditions necessary to produce a prototype aneutronic reactor, and to fully examine the theoretical principles of self-sustaining aneutronic energy.

SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The budget request proposes $408,509,000 for supporting research and technical analysis, including basic energy sciences. The Committee provides $387,109,000 for these activities, $3,500,000 below the House allowance and $11,400,000 below the budget request.

Basic energy sciences.—A total of $327,270,000 is included for basic energy research, a reduction of $22,900,000 below the budget request and $7,000,000 under the House allowance.

The Committee includes $3,000,000 for the National Center for Advanced Materials. Establishment of a unified center for materials research with a strong technology focus offers the potential for significant advances in this important field. Due to concerns over the scope of the project, the Committee defers action on the requested funding for the advanced light source portion of the project.

In view of the benefits of adequate review for new construction projects, as pointed out by the House report, the Committee has not included funding to initiate construction on the two projects—84–ER–14 and 84–ER–15—which were added by the House to the fiscal year 1984 budget request.

The Committee is concerned that the Department make every effort to complete construction projects within the proposed cost estimates. Therefore, prior to initial obligation of contruction funds for any project, the Department shall notify the Committees on Appropriations that all customary administrative reviews of construction projects have been satisfactorily completed for the project. By this notification the Department will certify that cost estimates are accurate and contain reasonable contingency; that a design basis exists adequate for initiation of construction; that the proposed method of performance of design and construction is adequate; that the sponsoring institution possesses an adequate construction management capability; and that the project is in compliance with all other regulations and provisions of law.

The following tabulation shows the Committee's recommendation by program for new budget authority in comparison with the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance:

LOAN PROGRAM

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
ARIZONA					
ROOSEVELT IRRIGATION DISTRICT........................	10,515,000	4,283,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	3,200,000
CALIFORNIA					
COLUSA COUNTY WATER DISTRICT.........................	12,316,000	500,000	2,000,000	5,000,000	2,000,000
EASTERN MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT NO. 2...............	17,320,000	10,230,000	3,181,000	3,181,000	3,181,000
FALLBROOK PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT....................	12,065,000	2,440,000	3,220,000	3,220,000	3,220,000
GLIDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT............................	5,875,000	400,000	1,694,000	1,694,000	1,694,000
GLENN-COLUSA IRRIGATION DISTRICT.....................	16,968,000	15,968,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
OAKDALE IRRIGATION DISTRICT..........................	17,774,000	---	---	3,070,000	---
RAMONA MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT......................	18,919,000	4,527,000	4,580,000	4,580,000	4,580,000
SAN BENITO CO. WATER CONSERV.& FLOOD CONTROL DIST.....	19,716,000	5,904,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
YUBA COUNTY WATER AGENCY.............................	21,482,000	600,000	3,000,000	8,400,000	3,000,000
NEBRASKA					
CENTRAL NEBR.PUBLIC POWER & I.D.-PHELPS SYSTEM IMPROV.	10,351,000	6,186,000	3,187,000	3,187,000	3,187,000

LOAN PROGRAM—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Total Federal cost (2)	Allocated to date (3)	Budget estimate (4)	House allowance (5)	Senate allowance (6)
OREGON					
GALESVILLE PROJECT..................................	24,300,000	---	---	---	4,000,000
TEXAS					
HIDALGO CO. WATER CON.& IMPROV. DIST. NO.1 (EDINBURG).	7,497,000	6,349,000	1,148,000	1,148,000	1,148,000
HIDALGO COUNTY IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO.2 (SAN JUAN)....	16,078,000	5,081,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
DELTA LAKE IRRIGATION DISTRICT......................	10,970,000	5,680,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
WASHINGTON					
COLUMBIA IRRIGATION DISTRICT........................	3,306,000	1,000,000	2,306,000	2,306,000	2,306,000
VARIOUS					
CONSTRUCTION COST INCREASES.........................	5,052,000	1,153,000	1,152,000	1,152,000	1,152,000
ADMINISTRATION OF LOAN PROGRAM......................	10,627,000	6,613,000	832,000	832,000	832,000
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	---	---	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-6,000,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM.............................			41,500,000	52,970,000	40,500,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
SOLAR ENERGY				
I. Solar applications				
A. Solar building energy systems.................	11,650	8,375	17,200	17,200
C. Photovoltaic energy systems				
Operating expenses...........................	58,035	32,700	45,200	54,200
Construction.................................	---	---	1,500	1,500
Subtotal, Photovoltaic energy systems............	58,035	32,700	46,700	55,700
D. Solar thermal energy systems				
Operating expenses...........................	49,100	13,325	33,750	30,600
Capital equipment............................	400	250	7,750	7,750
Subtotal, Solar thermal energy system............	49,500	13,575	41,500	38,350

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
E. Biomass and alcohol energy systems				
Operating expenses	16,000	17,300	29,000	29,000
F. Wind energy systems				
Operating expenses	31,300	8,600	26,500	26,500
Capital equipment	100	---	---	---
Subtotal, Wind energy systems	31,400	8,600	26,500	26,500
G. Ocean energy systems				
Operating expenses	10,500	---	7,000	8,000
Subtotal, Solar applications	177,085	80,550	167,900	174,750
(Operating expenses)	(176,585)	(80,300)	(158,650)	(165,500)
(Plant and Capital)	(500)	(250)	(9,250)	(9,250)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Other solar energy				
A. International solar energy program - OE	10,000	---	1,000	1,000
B. Solar technology transfer - OE	3,000	3,100	3,250	3,250
D. Alcohol fuels				
Operating expenses	5,000	---	---	---
E. Program support - OE	1,000	---	1,000	1,000
F. Program direction - OE	5,850	3,009	5,850	6,000
G. SERI	---	---	1,000	---
Subtotal, Other solar energy	24,850	6,109	12,100	11,250
General reduction	---	---	---	-10,000
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY	201,935	86,659	180,000	176,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)	(201,435)	(86,409)	(170,750)	(176,750)
(Plant and Capital)	(500)	(250)	(9,250)	(9,250)
(General reduction)	---	---	---	(-10,000)
GEOTHERMAL				
I. Hydrothermal industrialization				
Operating exrenses	6,000	---	---	2,000
Construction:				
80-6-2 Second 50 MWE demo plant, unknown site	27,020	---	---	---
Subtotal, Hydrothermal industrialization	33,020	---	---	2,000
II. Geopressured resources				
Operating expenses	8,400	---	5,000	5,000
III. Geothermal technology development				
Operating exrenses	14,708	13,059	21,459	21,459

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	250	---	---	---
Subtotal, Geothermal technology development	14,958	13,059	21,459	21,459
IV. Program direction - OE	1,250	494	1,000	1,000
TOTAL, GEOTHERMAL	57,628	13,553	27,459	29,459
(Operating expenses)	(30,358)	(13,553)	(27,459)	(29,459)
(Plant and Capital)	(27,270)	---	---	---
HYDROPOWER				
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE	1,750	---	500	500
II. Program direction - OE	250	---	250	250
TOTAL, HYDROPOWER	2,000	---	750	750

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE				
I. Electric energy systems				
A. Electric field effects research				
Operating expenses..............................	10,200	6,600	3,000	3,000
B. Reliability research				
Operating expenses..............................	6,500	6,000	3,500	3,500
C. Systems technology..............................	---	---	11,500	11,500
D. Program direction - OE..........................	500	102	500	500
Subtotal,Electric energy systems..................	17,200	12,702	18,500	18,500

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Energy Storage Systems				
A. Battery storage				
Operating expenses	18,000	14,000	18,000	18,000
B. Thermal and mechanical storage				
Operating expenses	7,000	---	7,000	7,000
C. Program direction - OE	700	200	700	700
Subtotal, Energy storage systems	25,700	14,200	25,700	25,700
TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE	42,900	26,902	44,200	44,200

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
NUCLEAR				
I. Converter reactor				
A. High temperature reactor technology				
Operating expenses	33,008	---	25,000	32,000
Capital equipment	2,280	---	---	2,000
Subtotal, High temperature reactor technology	35,288	---	25,000	34,000
B. Light water reactor systems				
Operating exrenses	10,000	15,000	24,000	15,000
C. Three Mile Island activities				
Operating expenses	24,000	33,000	33,000	33,000
Capital equipment	5,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Subtotal, Three Mile Island activities	29,000	37,000	37,000	37,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Advanced reactor systems				
Operating expenses	3,985	4,980	4,980	4,980
Capital equipment	200	---	---	---
Subtotal, Advanced reactor systems	4,185	4,980	4,980	4,980
E. Program direction - OE	359	1,190	1,190	1,190
Subtotal, Converter reactor	78,832	58,170	92,170	92,170
(Operating expenses)	(71,352)	(54,170)	(88,170)	(86,170)
(Plant and Capital)	(7,480)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(6,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Commercial nuclear waste				
1. Terminal isolation				
Operating expenses........................	21,600	4,700	4,700	4,700
Capital equipment..........................	400	---	---	---
Subtotal, Terminal isolation..................	22,000	4,700	4,700	4,700
2. Waste systems technology				
Operating expenses........................	8,925	9,440	9,440	9,440
Capital equipment..........................	470	360	360	360
Subtotal, Waste systems technology...........	9,395	9,800	9,800	9,800
3. Waste treatment technology				
Operating expenses........................	6,603	5,600	5,600	5,600
Capital equipment..........................	2,200	600	600	600

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
84-N-105 General plant projects...........	1,100	1,400	1,400	1,400
Subtotal, Waste treatment technology..........	9,903	7,600	7,600	7,600
4. Program direction - OE.....................	871	480	480	480
Subtotal, Commercial nuclear waste...............	42,169	22,580	22,580	22,580
(Operating expenses)...........................	(37,999)	(20,220)	(20,220)	(20,220)
(Plant and Capital)...........................	(4,170)	(2,360)	(2,360)	(2,360)
III. Remedial action				
1. Management of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities				
Operating expenses........................	12,458	15,360	15,360	15,360

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	475	140	140	140
Subtotal, Management, of surplus radioactivity contaminated DOE facilities	12,933	15,500	15,500	15,500
2. Remedial action for former DOE contractors installation MED/AEC sites				
Operating expenses	11,400	11,700	16,700	16,700
Capital equipment	300	300	300	300
Subtotal, Remedial action for former DOE cont installation MED/AEC sites	11,700	12,000	17,000	17,000
3. Grand Junction remedial action OE	1,672	1,500	1,500	1,500
4. Remedial action for inactive uranium mill tailing sites				
Operating expenses	19,788	27,125	27,125	27,125

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment...........................	1,046	775	775	775
Subtotal, Remedial action for inactive uranium mill tailing sites..................	20,834	27,900	27,900	27,900
5. West Valley				
Operating expenses..........................	12,400	36,000	36,000	36,000
Capital equipment...........................	500	---	---	---
Construction:				
83-N-327 West Valley demo. project West Valley, N.Y..........................	2,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, West Valley........................	14,900	36,000	36,000	36,000
6. Program direction - OE.....................	857	1,085	1,085	1,085
Subtotal, Remedial action.......................	62,896	93,985	98,985	98,985
(Operating expenses)................................	(58,575)	(92,770)	(97,770)	(97,770)
(Plant and Capital)................................	(4,321)	(1,215)	(1,215)	(1,215)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Nuclear fuel cycle				
A. Spent fuel technology				
Operating expenses	5,421	4,500	4,500	4,500
Capital equipment	968	500	500	500
Subtotal, Spent fuel technology	6,389	5,000	5,000	5,000
B. Fuel cycle R&D				
Operating expenses	31,809	31,385	31,385	31,385
Capital equipment	3,600	4,000	4,000	4,000
Subtotal, Fuel cycle R&D	35,409	35,385	35,385	35,385
C. Program direction - OE	853	1,422	1,422	1,422
Subtotal, Nuclear fuel cycle	42,651	41,807	41,807	41,807

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)............................	(38,083)	(37,307)	(37,307)	(37,307)
(Plant and Capital)............................	(4,568)	(4,500)	(4,500)	(4,500)
V. Advanced nuclear systems				
A. Space and terrestrial applications				
Operating expenses...........................	35,198	30,135	30,135	30,135
Capital equipment............................	2,764	2,600	2,600	2,600
Subtotal, Space and terrestrial applications.....	37,962	32,735	32,735	32,735
B. Program direction - OE.......................	981	1,370	1,370	1,370
Subtotal, Advanced nuclear systems...............	38,943	34,105	34,105	34,105
(Operating expenses)............................	(36,179)	(31,505)	(31,505)	(31,505)
(Plant and Capital)............................	(2,764)	(2,600)	(2,600)	(2,600)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
VI. Breeder reactor systems				
A. Liquid metal fast breeder reactor				
Operating expenses	263,299	255,600	255,600	263,600
Capital equipment	20,608	19,100	19,100	21,100
Construction:				
84-N-101 General plant projects	---	1,000	1,000	1,000
84-N-102 Mods. to reactors	---	4,000	4,000	4,000
83-N-334 Safeguards & sec. Assess, imp., ANL,INEL,Id	400	1,000	1,000	1,000
83-N-331 GPP	3,000	---	---	---
83-N-332 Mods. to reac.,bar. var. loc	900	---	---	---
78-6-C Safety research experimental facility, INEL, Idaho (A-E, Long-lead procurement and limited construction only)	9,000	1,100	1,100	1,100

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
78-6-E Liquid metal engineering center modifications, liquid metal engineering center, Santa Susana, California (A-E and long-lead procurement only)..................	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
78-6-F Fuels & materials examination facility, richland, WA.......................	6,700	---	8,000	---
Subtotal, Construction........................	25,000	12,100	20,100	12,100
Subtotal, Liquid metal fast breeder reactor......	308,907	286,800	294,800	296,800
B. Clinch River Breeder Reactor demonstration-OE.	187,922	270,025	---	---
C. Water cocled breeder reactor				
Operating expenses............................	44,784	35,500	35,500	35,500
Capital equipment.............................	200	---	---	---
Subtotal, Water cooled breeder reactor...........	44,984	35,500	35,500	35,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction - OE	8,061	10,200	10,200	10,200
Subtotal, Breeder reactor systems	549,874	602,525	340,500	342,500
(Operating expenses)	(504,066)	(571,325)	(301,300)	(309,300)
(Plant and Capital)	(45,808)	(31,200)	(39,200)	(33,200)
TOTAL, NUCLEAR	815,365	853,172	630,147	627,147
(Operating expenses)	(746,254)	(807,297)	(576,272)	(577,272)
(Plant and Capital)	(69,111)	(45,875)	(53,875)	(49,875)
ENVIRONMENT				
I. Overview and assessment				
Operating expenses	31,845	30,400	30,400	30,400
Capital equipment	4,500	1,600	1,600	1,600
Construction - LGF test facility	---	3,000	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Overview and assessment	36,345	35,000	33,000	33,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Biological and environmental research				
Operating expenses........................	165,587	157,900	178,900	171,900
Capital equipment.........................	11,677	7,700	7,700	7,700
Construction:				
84-ER-133 General plant projects..........	2,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Biological and environ. research....	179,264	166,600	187,600	180,600
III. Program direction - OE..........................				
A. Overview and assessment - PD............	5,350	5,375	5,375	5,375
B. Bio. and env. research - PD.............	3,350	3,600	3,600	3,600
Subtotal, Program direction - OE.............	8,700	8,975	8,975	8,975
Total, Environment............................	224,309	210,575	229,575	222,575
(Operating expenses)............................	(206,132)	(197,275)	(218,275)	(211,275)
(Plant and Capital)............................	(18,177)	(13,300)	(11,300)	(11,300)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
FUSION				
I. Magnetic fusion				
A. Confinement systems				
Operating expenses..............................	181,038	186,050	182,050	186,050
Capital equipment..............................	21,800	20,650	20,650	20,650
Construction:				
80-MF-3 EBT Proof of principal exp...........	10,000	---	2,000	---
Subtotal, Confinement systems.....................	212,838	206,700	204,700	206,700
B. Development and technology				
Operating expenses..............................	74,300	77,310	82,310	78,310
Capital equipment..............................	9,700	7,740	7,740	7,740
Subtotal, Development and technology.............	84,000	85,050	90,050	86,050

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Applied plasma physics				
Operating expenses..............................	73,300	76,040	74,040	79,540
Capital equipment..............................	4,000	5,060	5,060	5,060
Subtotal, Applied plasma physics..................	77,300	81,100	79,100	84,600
D. Planning and projects				
Operating expenses..............................	35,962	48,700	48,700	48,700
Capital equipment..............................	4,000	4,350	4,350	4,350
Construction:				
84-GPP General plant projects.................	6,000	6,500	6,500	6,500
78-3-A Mirror fusion test facility...........	40,000	30,000	30,000	30,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
78-3-B Fusion materials irradiation test facility, Hanford engineering lab, WA.........	2,000	---	5,000	---
Subtotal, Construction........................	48,000	36,500	41,500	36,500
Subtotal, Planning and projects..................	87,962	89,550	94,550	89,550
E. Program direction - OE......................	4,000	4,600	4,600	4,600
Total, Fusion..................................	466,100	467,000	473,000	471,500
(Operating expenses)...........................	(368,600)	(392,700)	(391,700)	(397,200)
(Plant and Capital)...........................	(97,500)	(74,300)	(81,300)	(74,300)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS				
I. Basic energy sciences				
A. Nuclear sciences				
Operating expenses	30,644	37,900	37,900	37,900
Capital equipment	1,556	2,150	2,150	2,150
Construction:				
84-ER-141 A I P	- --	270	270	270
Subtotal, Nuclear sciences	32,200	40,320	40,320	40,320
B. Materials sciences				
Operating expenses	108,700	125,110	125,110	125,110
Capital equipment	8,510	12,780	12,780	12,780
Construction:				
84-ER-111 N S L S	---	2,500	2,500	2,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-ER-112 National center for adv materials..	---	25,900	---	3,000
84-ER-141 A I P..............................	---	640	640	640
84-ER-142 General plant projects.............	300	300	300	300
84-ER-14 Vitreous State Laboratory...........	---	---	5,000	---
84-ER-15 National Center for Chemical Research..................................	---	---	5,000	---
83-E-301 Improvs. to weapons Neutron ras. fac., LASL, N.M.................	2,700	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction.......................	3,000	29,340	13,440	6,440
Subtotal, Materials sciences....................	120,210	167,230	151,330	144,330

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Chemical sciences				
Operating expenses	70,000	75,500	75,500	75,500
Capital equipment	5,510	6,520	6,520	6,520
Construction:				
84-ER-141 A I P	---	350	350	350
84-ER-142 General plant projects	---	100	100	100
83-E-302	400	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	400	450	450	450
Subtotal, Chemical sciences	75,910	82,470	82,470	82,470
D. Engineering, mathematical, and geosciences				
Operating expenses	31,050	33,670	33,670	33,670

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	1,920	2,120	2,120	2,120
Subtotal, Engineering, math., and geosciences	32,970	35,790	35,790	35,790
E. Advanced energy projects				
Operating expenses	8,300	9,100	9,100	9,100
Capital equipment	290	310	310	310
Subtotal, Advanced energy projects	8,590	9,410	9,410	9,410
F. Biological energy research				
Operating expenses	9,500	10,580	10,580	10,580
Capital equipment	370	400	400	400
Subtotal, Biological energy research	9,870	10,980	10,980	10,980
G. Program direction - OE	3,100	3,970	3,970	3,970
Subtotal, Basic energy sciences	282,850	350,170	334,270	327,270

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
(Operating expenses)............................	(261,294)	(295,830)	(295,830)	(295,830)
(Plant and Capital)............................	(21,556)	(54,340)	(38,440)	(31,440)
II. Energy oversight, research analy. & Univ support				
A. Energy research analysis - OE				
1. Assessment projects.........................	2,824	2,869	2,869	2,869
B. University research support - OE				
2. University reactor fuel assistance.........	1,600	1,500	1,500	1,500
3. University laboratory coop. program........	4,400	3,500	3,500	3,500
5. Energy manpower assessment program.........	---	270	270	270
6. Education and training......................	---	200	200	200
Subtotal, University research support - OE.......	6,000	5,470	5,470	5,470
C. University research instrumentation...........	---	6,000	4,000	6,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction and oversight - OE..........	2,603	3,400	3,400	3,400
	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------
Subtotal, Energy oversight, res analy, & Univ sup	11,427	17,739	15,739	17,739
III. Multi-program facilities				
Construction:				
84-ER-101 Rehab. old utilities (LBL).........	---	1,000	1,000	1,000
84-ER-102 Cooling water facility, Restor. (ORNL).............................	---	600	600	600
84-ER-103 Road repair (various locations)....	---	3,000	3,000	3,000
84-ER-104 Facilities support Projects (various locations).................	---	4,000	4,000	4,000
83-E-308 Rep power sys,INEL,LLNL,ORNL,RL.....	5,000	7,988	7,988	7,988
83-E-309 Electronics fac., ANL...............	1,200	4,150	4,150	4,150

URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM COSTS

Appropriations, 1983	$1,942,136,000
Budget estimate, 1984	2,240,000,000
House allowance	2,235,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,235,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−5,000,000
House allowance	

GROSS REVENUES

Appropriations, 1983	$1,968,319,000
Budget estimate, 1984	2,240,000,000
House allowance	2,235,000,000
Committee recommendation	2,235,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−5,000,000
House allowance	

This appropriation provides for expenses of the Department of Energy in connection with operating expenses, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other related incidental expenses necessary for uranium supply and enrichment activities. In this account, the revenues received from the enrichment of uranium are retained and used to offset costs incurred by the Department in providing uranium enrichment and other services.

The Committee recommends $2,235,000,000 for uranium supply and enrichment activities, this is the same as the House allowance and $5,000,000 lower than the budget request.

Gaseous diffusion program.—The Committee recommendation includes $1,481,30,000, the same as the budget request and $290,897,000 over the fiscal year 1983 level. At present, the Department enriches uranium for its domestic and foreign customers at three gaseous diffusion enrichment plants. The Department is nearing completion of a 10-year, $1,500,000,000 program to improve efficiency at the existing plants, and to increase their production capacity to meet potential future demand. In recent years, the plants have been operating at only about 40 percent of capacity while adequately providing for all domestic and foreign requirements.

Due to the low level of operations and to the long-term power contracts, the Department is obligated to pay capacity charges for power which is not delivered or used. The Committee again notes with concern the inclusion of a large amount, $243,000,000, in the 1984 budget request for demand payments for power not purchased under the contracts with three power suppliers.

Gas centrifuge program.—The Committee recommends $666,800,000 for the gas centrifuge program, a reduction of $15,000,000 below the budget request and $6,000,000 over the House allowance.

For operating expenses, the recommendation of $122,400,000 is $16,000,000 over the House allowance and budget request. The Committee has provided additional funding to support accelerated research and related activities aimed at expediting the development of advanced gas centrifuge technology. The advanced gas centrifuge program is designed to decrease GCEP separative work costs by development of a progression of three centrifuge machine designs to replace the less efficient baseline GCEP machines. The Committee believes that the Department should place increased emphasis on advanced machine development and should continue to place more responsibility upon industry for development of baseline and advanced gas centrifuge technology.

For project 76–8–G, enriched uranium production facilities (GCEP), Portsmouth, Ohio, the Committee recommends $541,000,000 in lieu of $572,000,000 as requested in the budget request and $551,000,000 in the House allowance.

Two recent reports, one by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and another by the Congressional Research Service (CRS), question the need to continue construction of the GCEP facility. This uncertainty is based on an extensive analysis of future demand for DOE enrichment services, the emergence of foreign uranium enrichment capacity, unit price, and the development of an advanced isotope separation technology (AIS).

The design of GCEP was initiated in fiscal year 1976 and construction began in fiscal year 1979. The original design calls for eight process buildings with an expected cost of at least $7,000,000,000 (in 1983 dollars). At the end of fiscal year 1982, DOE spent approximately $1,200,000,000 on design and construction of the plant. Most of these funds have been spent on (1) partial construction of two of the eight planned centrifuge machine process buildings, (2) partial or complete construction of many other facilities which will support the entire plant of all eight buildings, and (3) site preparation for all eight process buildings.

When Congress authorized construction of GCEP in 1975, demand for U.S. enrichment services was expected to exceed the increased capacity of improved gaseous diffusion plants by the early 1980's. With the dramatic decline in projections for nuclear powerplants, it appears clear, and both the GAO and CRS studies conclude, that there is sufficient U.S. enrichment capacity with GCEP to satisfy projected demand for enrichment services through the year 2000 or beyond. There is also a worldwide surplus of uranium enrichment capacity. As noted earlier, the existing three diffusion plants are operating at less than half of their capacity.

Therefore, updated data indicates that the GCEP plant must be viewed as replacement capacity for the diffusion plants which are now being renovated. And even with a sharp reversal in the outlook for nuclear power, new enrichment capacity can be brought on line faster than new nuclear powerplants.

Based on the more recent projections and analysis, the Committee shares the concerns expressed by the House Committee in Report 98–217 with regard to the rate of procurement of the baseline centrifuge machines. The Department shall make certain that any proposed reduction in these activities should not adversely delay plans to install machines at the earliest possible date so as to reduce enrichment service

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-E-310 Utility replacements................	1,300	7,500	7,500	7,500
83-E-311 Emergency response center, ORNL.....	2,000	2,200	2,200	2,200
82-E-301 300 area utilities (HEDL)...........	6,200	4,400	4,400	4,400
82-E-302 Security facility (ANL).............	3,200	2,300	2,300	2,300
82-E-305 Traffic safety improvements (HEDL)..	2,400	800	800	800
81-E-309 Rehab of gen pur plant (ANL)........	1,950	---	---	---
81-E-310 Trans & distr system upgrade (RL)...	50	---	---	---
81-E-318 Upgrade primary substation (ORNL) ..	200	---	---	---
81-E-321 Site utilities project (LLL)	2,200	---	---	---
81-E-323 Fire safety improvements (ANL)	1,100	---	---	---
81-E-325 Energy Technology Lab (Sandia)......	3,200	1,600	1,600	3,100

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
80-ES-11 Idaho Lab Facility (INEL)...........	4,000	1,062	1,062	1,062
Subtotal, Multi-program facilities...............	34,000	40,600	40,600	42,100
Total, Supporting research and tech. analysis....	328,277	408,509	390,609	387,109
(Operating expenses)...........................	(272,721)	(313,569)	(311,569)	(313,569)
(Plant and Capital)...........................	(55,556)	(94,940)	(79,040)	(73,540)
POLICY AND MANAGEMENT				
I. Policy and Management				
A. Policy and management - OE - ER...............	1,250	515	1,288	1,288
B. Policy and management - OE - NE...............	1,584	1,370	1,868	1,600
C. Policy and management - OE - EP...............	2,103	900	1,611	1,611

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Policy and management - OE - CRE	813	970	970	970
Subtotal, Policy and management	5,750	3,755	5,737	5,469
ENERGY APPLICATIONS				
I. Technical Information Center				
Operating expenses	14,103	13,300	15,200	13,300
Capital equipment	1,150	800	800	800
Subtotal, Technical Information Center	15,253	14,100	16,000	14,100
II. In-house energy management				
Operating expenses	500	1,200	1,200	1,200
Construction:				
84-A-601 Mods for energy Mgmt., various locations	13,500	11,500	11,500	11,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-A-602 Residual energy applications........	---	---	1,332	---
82-A-603 LASL Hot water distribution.........	2,000	1,700	1,700	1,700
Subtotal, Construction........................	15,500	13,200	14,532	13,200
Subtotal, In-house energy management.............	16,000	14,400	15,732	14,400
(Operating expenses)............................	(500)	(1,200)	(1,200)	(1,200)
(Plant and Capital)............................	(15,500)	(13,200)	(14,532)	(13,200)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Plant engineering and design				
Construction:				
82-C-601 Plant engineering and design........	700	1,000	1,000	1,000
Subtotal, Energy applications....................	31,953	29,500	32,732	29,500
(Operating expenses)............................	(14,603)	(14,500)	(16,400)	(14,500)
(Plant and Capital)...........................	(17,350)	(15,000)	(16,332)	(15,000)
SUBTOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT......	2,176,217	2,099,625	2,014,209	2,003,709
(Operating expenses).................................	(1,890,753)	(1,855,960)	(1,763,112)	(1,762,444)
(Plant and Capital)................................	(285,464)	(243,665)	(251,097)	(241,265)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Adjustments:				
Undistributed - CS (ESRD - PACE)......................	67,512	---	---	---
Undistributed CS-OE................................	5,226	---	---	---
Reserve for reimbursables............................	1,117	---	---	---
FY 1983 deferrals carried forward.....................	- -	- -	-50,000	-55,000
Total, Adjustments..................................	73,855	---	-50,000	-55,000
TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.........	2,250,072	2,099,625	1,964,209	1,943,709
(Operating expenses)..................................	(1,897,096)	(1,855,960)	(1,713,112)	(1,720,444)
(Plant and Capital).................................	(352,976)	(243,665)	(251,097)	(233,265)
(General reduction)..................................	---	---	---	(-10,000)

costs and to help prevent further erosion to the U.S. market position. Testimony before the Committee indicates that a slight reduction in fiscal year 1984 procurement can be implemented without an adverse effect on industrial manufacturing capability. Moreover, the Committee believes it is critical to carefully review the pace of the program before entering into new contractual commitments which would substantially increase the procurement of baseline machines. Therefore, the Committee concurs in the direction by the House appropriations and authorization committees for a thorough review and report to be submitted to Congress early in fiscal year 1984 and before the Department enters into phase II contracts. Accordingly, no funds are available for phase II contract procurement, an extension of phase I contracts, or any other action which obligates the Federal Government to procure substantially higher quantities of baseline machines without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

Advanced isotope separation technology.—The Committee recommends $103,900,000 for advanced isotope separation enrichment technology, $30,000,000 above the budget request and $20,000,000 more than the House.

Although in a relative early stage of development, the Department believes this process may reduce the costs of enriching uranium substantially below the costs of either of the other two enriching technologies—gaseous diffusion and gas centrifuge. The recommendation provides for accelerated development of this credible, low-cost alternative for uranium enrichment production.

The following table shows the Committee's recommendation by program:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
URANIUM ENRICHMENT				
I. Uranium enrichment activities				
A. Gaseous diffusion and operations support				
Operating expenses	1,097,953	1,400,400	1,400,400	1,400,400
Capital equipment	21,600	9,900	9,900	9,900
Construction:				
84-N-401 General plant projects	---	13,300	13,300	13,300
84-N-402 UF6 cylinders	---	4,000	4,000	4,000
84-N-403 Intermediate gas removal	---	1,700	1,700	1,700
84-N-404 Power systems protection impr	---	3,000	3,000	3,000
84-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase III	---	6,000	6,000	6,000
83-N-401 Rep. of elec. circuit breaker Gas dif. plant, Portsmouth, Ohio	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-N-402 Compli. with toxic sub. Control act, gas dif. plants.................	6,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
83-N-403 UF6 cylinders storage Yards, gas. dif. plants......................	10,000	---	- -	---
83-N-404 GPP gas. dif. plants................	17,650	---	---	---
83-N-405 Utilities upgrading, Phase II, gas. dif. plant....................	8,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
82-R-412 Cooling tower mods..................	1,000	- --	---	---
82-R-413 IMP UF6 containment.................	20,900	9,000	9,000	9,000
82-R-415 Fire alarm sys rep..................	300	---	---	---
82-R-416 Env/safety mods.....................	---	3,500	3,500	3,500

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-R-506 Environmental protection and safety improvements, Phase I GDP's..................	---	3,500	3,500	3,500
Subtotal, Construction..........................	70,850	71,000	71,000	71,000
Subtotal, Gaseous diffusion operations and suppo	1,190,403	1,481,300	1,481,300	1,481,300
B. Gaseous centrifuge operations and support				
Operating expenses............................	86,200	106,400	106,400	122,400
Capital equipment............................	3,800	3,400	3,400	3,400
Construction:				
82-R-418 Advanced test facility..............	4,500	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
76-8-G Enriched Uranium production facility, Portsmouth, OH..............................	588,000	572,000	551,000	541,000
Subtotal, Construction........................	592,500	572,000	551,000	541,000
Subtotal, Gas centrifuge operations and support.	682,500	681,800	660,800	666,800
C. Program direction - OE........................	3,100	3,900	3,900	3,900
D. Advanced isotope separation technology				
Operating expenses...........................	39,233	59,900	59,900	89,900
Capital equipment............................	2,500	9,500	9,500	9,500
Construction:				
84-N-406 General plant projects.............	900	1,200	1,200	1,200
84-N-407 Development I demonstration Module (design only).........................	---	2,400	12,400	2,400

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-N-405 Development modifications...........	8,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction........................	8,900	3,600	13,600	3,600
Subtotal, Advanced isotope separation technology	50,633	73,000	83,000	103,000
E. Program direction - OE......................	550	---	---	---
General reduction..............................	---	---	---	-20,000
Subtotal, Uranium enrichment activities..........	1,927,186	2,240,000	2,229,000	2,235,000
(Operating expenses)............................	(1,227,036)	(1,570,600)	(1,570,600)	(1,616,600)
(Plant and Capital)............................	(700,150)	(669,400)	(658,400)	(638,400)
(General reduction).............................	---	---	---	(-20,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
II. Uranium resource assessment				
A. Assessment program				
Operating expenses	3,000	---	6,000	---
B. Program direction - OE	2,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Uranium resource assessment	5,000	---	6,000	---
Total, Uranium enrichment	1,932,186	2,240,000	2,235,000	2,235,000
III. Offsetting revenues				
Operating expenses	-1,265,869	-1,570,600	-1,565,600	-1,565,600
Capital equipment	-27,900	-22,800	-22,800	-22,800
Construction	-674,550	-646,600	-646,600	-646,600
Subtotal, Offsetting revenues	-1,968,319	-2,240,000	-2,235,000	-2,235,000

General Science and Research Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$411,853,000
Budget estimate, 1984	479,750,000
House allowance	481,750,000
Committee recommendation	462,750,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−17,000,000
House allowance	−19,000,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1983	$123,316,000
Budget estimate, 1984	165,500,000
House allowance	161,500,000
Committee recommendation	172,500,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+7,000,000
House allowance	+11,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $635,250,000 for General Science and Research Activities.

The appropriation recommended for Operating Expenses, General Science and Research Activities provides for fundamental research in Life Sciences and Biomedical Applications, High Energy Physics, and Nuclear Physics.

The budget request for general science and research is $645,250,000, an increase of $95,081,000 over the fiscal year 1983 appropriation. The Committee supports a significant increase in funding and believes the recommendation represents continuing strong support for the highest priority research activities.

High energy physics.—The Committee recommends $490,000,000 for high energy physics, the same as the budget request and $4,000,000 over the House allowance. This recommendation is $76,199,000 more than the fiscal year 1982 level.

Project 78–10–B, the intersecting storage accelerator (ISABELLE), the Department requested no construction funding for the project and is engaged in extensive studies of alternatives which might have lower costs. Nevertheless, the Committee provides $7,000,000 for ISABELLE to preserve the construction option. These funds are to be made available after completion of the studies and upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Energy to proceed with the project or project alternative.

The Committee recommends that up to $1,000,000 be made available to obtain a more precise understanding of the upper limits of muon catalysis. Recent experiments suggest that the physics of this process warrant a more complete investigation.

An additional $700,000 shall be provided to the Office of Energy Research to maintain activities related to the evaluated nuclear data file at a level corresponding to the fiscal year 1982 program level.

The following tabulation shows the Committee recommendation for each program and activity:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Undistributed - PACE................................	9,950	---	---	---
TOTAL, URANIUM ENRICHMENT............................	-26,183	---	---	---
(Operating expenses)................................	(1,232,036)	(1,570,600)	(1,576,600)	(1,616,600)
(Plant and Capital)................................	(710,100)	(669,400)	(658,400)	(638,400)
(General reduction).................................	---	---	---	(-20,000)
(Gross revenues)....................................	(-1,968,319)	(-2,240,000)	(-2,235,000)	(-2,235,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH				
I. High energy physics				
A. Physics research				
Operating expenses	87,695	101,500	100,500	99,500
B. Facility operations				
Operating expenses	145,400	166,000	166,000	161,000
Capital equipment	44,000	48,000	48,000	48,000
Construction:				
84-ER-131 AIP	8,000	9,000	9,000	9,000
84-ER-132 GPP	6,500	7,000	7,000	7,000
84-ER-133 SLAC linear collider (SLC)	---	40,000	32,000	40,000
82-E-206 Tevatron II	18,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
81-E-218 Tevatron I	18,000	20,000	20,000	20,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
79-9-B Energy saver, fermi national lab Batavia IL	952	---	---	---
78-10-B Intersecting storage accelerator (Isabelle) Brookhaven national lab, NY	5,000	---	5,000	7,000
75-6-C Positron Electron Joint Project	1,254	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	57,706	89,000	86,000	96,000
Subtotal, Facility operations	247,106	303,000	300,000	305,000
C. High energy technology				
Operating expenses	75,500	82,000	82,000	82,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Other capital equipment - CE	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
Subtotal, High energy physics	413,801	490,000	486,000	490,000
(Operating expenses)	(308,595)	(349,500)	(348,500)	(342,500)
(Plant and Capital)	(105,206)	(140,500)	(137,500)	(147,500)
II. Nuclear physics				
A. Medium energy physics				
Operating expenses	53,258	59,000	62,000	59,000
B. Heavy ion physics				
Operating expenses	39,700	47,000	47,000	47,000
C. Low energy physics				
Operating expenses	12,257	13,000	13,000	13,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Nuclear theory				
Operating expenses	8,150	9,000	9,000	9,000
Capital equipment	9,610	10,500	10,500	10,500
Construction:				
84-ER-110 Univ Accel upgrade	---	8,000	7,000	8,000
84-ER-121 AIP	1,800	3,500	3,500	3,500
84-ER-122 GPP	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200
82-E-223 Argonne tandem acc sys - ATLAS	3,700	---	- -	---
Subtotal Construction	17,310	24,200	23,200	24,200
E. Other capital equipment - CE	800	800	800	800
Subtotal, Nuclear physics	131,475	153,000	155,000	153,000
(Operating expenses)	(113,365)	(128,000)	(131,000)	(128,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(18,110)	(25,000)	(24,000)	(25,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. General Science program direction - OE	1,413	2,250	2,250	2,250
General reduction	---	---	---	-10,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	546,689	645,250	643,250	635,250
(Operating expenses)	(423,373)	(479,750)	(481,750)	(472,750)
(Plant and Capital)	(123,316)	(165,500)	(161,500)	(172,500)
(General reduction)	---	---	---	(-10,000)
Adjustments:				
Unobligated balance transferred from ESRD - ER(GS-OE).	-11,520	---	---	---
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH	535,169	645,250	643,250	635,250
(Operating expenses)	(411,853)	(479,750)	(481,750)	(472,750)
(Plant and Capital)	(123,316)	(165,500)	(161,500)	(172,500)
(General reduction)	---	---	---	(-10,000)

NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL ACTIVITIES

Appropriations, 1983	$217,325,000
Budget estimate, 1984	306,675,000
House allowance	306,675,000
Committee recommendation	306,675,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	…………
House allowance	…………

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (Public Law 97–425) establishes the nuclear waste disposal fund to finance activities related to development, construction, and operation of a commercial high-level waste repository and studies of monitored retrievable storage (MRS) concepts.

The fund is to be financed by fees paid by nuclear utilities. To enable waste disposal activities to begin in fiscal year 1983, $217,325,000 has been allocated for fiscal year 1983 from funds provided in the continuing resolution. The budget request in fiscal year 1984 is $306,675,000, while fee collections are expected to total $448,000,000. Revenues are to offset required appropriations, with revenues in excess of requirements being retained in the fund as offsets to future needs. A projection of fees to finance the fund through fiscal year 1988 is as follows:

PROJECTED ANNUAL FEES

Fiscal year:	*Millions*
1983	$98
1984	448
1985	482
1986	531
1987	591
1988	640

The Committee recommendation for fiscal year 1984 for the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund is the budget request level of $306,675,000. The Department has made much progress to date in starting up and commencing the activities required under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. This is complex legislation that mandates numerous chronological and technological accomplishments and the Department has handled this task in an expeditious manner.

The Secretary shall research the various types of media so that all suitable media, in all geohydrologic settings, will be fully considered prior to the time for selection of the second nuclear waste repository. Prior to the submission of the fiscal year 1985 budget request, the Secretary shall submit a plan for consideration of the various geological media and shall report on his views with respect to the findings of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in "Differential Lead Retention in Zircons: Implications for Nuclear Waste Containment." This effort is not intended to substantively change any of the statutory responsibilities of the Secretary in achieving the selection of the second repository as specified in Public Law 97–425.

The total amount approved by the Committee for nuclear waste disposal activities includes $12,000,000 for implementation of section 141 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which established a program for monitored retrievable storage of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste.

Atomic Energy Defense Activities

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$4,375,700,000
Budget estimate, 1984	5,215,125,000
House allowance	5,084,325,000
Committee recommendation	5,098,925,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−116,200,000
House allowance	+14,600,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1983	$1,328,000,000
Budget estimate, 1984	1,610,450,000
House allowance	1,474,050,000
Committee recommendation	1,401,950,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−208,500,000
House allowance	−72,100,000

The Committee recommends a total appropriation of $6,500,875,000 for atomic energy defense activities.

The appropriation recommended for atomic energy defense activities supports inertial confinement fusion, naval reactors development, the research, development, testing, production and stockpile maintenance for nuclear weapons, verification and control technology, special materials production, defense waste management and nuclear materials security and safeguards.

WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

The Committee recommends substantial increases in spending for the research, development, testing, production, and surveillance of nuclear weapons in order to meet defense requirements. The budget includes funds for the production of nine nuclear weapons systems—the B61–3 and –4 bombs, the W70–3 warhead for the Lance missile, the W76 warhead for the Trident, the W78 warhead for the Minuteman II, the W79 warhead for the artillery fired atomic projectile, the W80–0 warhead for the sea launched cruise missile, the W80–1 warhead for the air launched cruise missile, the B83 modern strategic bomb, the W84 warhead for the ground launched cruise missile, and the W85 Pershing II missile warheads.

Efforts are also underway in anticipation of future production of a number of additional nuclear warheads and bombs.

Research and development.—The Committee recommends $823,580,000 for research and development activities, an increase of $81,780,000 over the 1982 level and $600,000 over the House allowance.

The recommendation for operating expenses includes sufficient funds for an increase of the 80 full-time positions as requested by the administration. The recommendation also includes $3,000,000 for additional operating expenses at the Los Alamos physics facility to bring the number of operating weeks to the level funded in fiscal year 1983.

Project 84–D–101, general plant projects, the recommendation includes $15,000,000, a reduction of $5,000,000 below the budget request, but a 20-percent increase over fiscal year 1983.

Project 84–D–102, radiation hardened integrated circuit lab, the Committee recommends $2,000,000 to provide for this needed addition to the weapons program.

Testing.—The Committee recommends $546,100,000 for testing activities which is $103,500,000 over the current funding level and $15,000,000 below the budget request.

For operating expenses, the recommendation includes $475,900,000, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

Project 84–D–107, nuclear test facilities revitalization, the recommendation includes $23,500,000 to initiate this project in lieu of the $38,500,000 requested in the budget.

Inertial confinement fusion.—The Committee recommendation provides $151,800,000 for the ICF program, the same as the budget request.

The Department is attempting to consolidate and refocus the program and the Committee believes it is prudent to allow this process to occur in an orderly manner.

Production and surveillance.—The Committee recommendation provides for $2,153,415,000 for production, surveillance, and maintenance of nuclear weapons, which is $68,300,000 over the House allowance and $252,515,000 above fiscal year 1983.

For operating expenses, the recommendation includes $1,711,915,000, an increase of $90,000,000 over the House allowance and $237,415,000 above the fiscal year 1982 level. The Committee did not include the total increase requested since new production of warheads and overall workload has not substantially increased. The reduction also reflects and is consistent with the Committee action to defer funding of facilities for the SM–2 warhead, the ASW warhead, and the Sentry warhead.

The Committee believes that with prudent management the recommended levels will be adequate to maintain production schedules for all system delivery requirements, modifications, and retirements as well as meeting essential needs in other areas.

For construction, the recommendation provides $335,100,000, which is $13,700,000 below the House. The Committee concurs with the Senate Armed Services Committee deferral of projects which provide facilities to begin production of the antisubmarine warhead, the SM–2 missile warhead, and the Sentry warhead. The Committee is not satisfied that the Department has adequately justified the need for these warheads, nor has it justified the need to begin facilities construction in fiscal year 1984 to meet planned schedules.

The Committee recommendation provides the full budget request for Trident II warhead production, the MX warhead facilities, and the cruise missile programs.

Project 84–D–111, general plant projects, the Committee provides $25,000,000, an increase of $5,000,000 over the House allowance and $4,500,000 below the budget request.

Project 84–D–120, explosive component test facility, the recommendation would reduce the $13,100,000 budget request by $10,000,000, because the Department cannot obligate the full amount requested.

Project 82–D–107, utilities and equipment restoration program, the Committee provides $185,000,000 for this restoration and upgrade program, the same as the House and $30,600,000 over the fiscal year 1983 level. The Committee is reluctant to make reductions in this project, because efforts to date are beginning to signal increased efficiencies and reduced cost. Current budget constraints, however, make it necessary to slow the growth of the program.

Project 81–D–115, MX warhead facilities, the Committee provides $30,000,000, the same as the budget request and $10,000,000 more than the House allowance. Obligation of this funding is contingent upon approval by the Committee on Appropriations and the Armed Services Committee in order to insure that expenditures on warhead production facilities are consistent with congressional action on the MX missile system.

Project 82–D–109, 155 mm artillery fired atomic projectile (AFAP). Development of a new 155mm nuclear projectile began in 1969 with the Army stating a need for a modernized artillery shell to replace the deployed W48. Development of the W74 warhead began that year and continued until 1973 when the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy terminated the program due to excessive cost and the use of obsolete technology. Requests to reinitiate the 155mm development were denied by Congress in 1975 and 1976, but, in 1977, a new analysis of modernization requirements led to congressional authorization and appropriation of funds to reinitiate a research program.

The research development of the new projectile continued until 1979 when the Secretary of Defense directed a deep cut in the fiscal year 1981 budget request and then eliminated development funds in fiscal year 1982. Pursuant to the revised budget request, Congress approved further research and development engineering funds for the new 155mm nuclear warhead, the W82, in fiscal year 1982.

The fiscal year 1983 budget request proposed $40,000,000 for production facilities and equipment for the W82, 155mm artillery warhead. Citing the high costs of the warhead and the uncertainty of deployment, Congress did not provide any production funds for the W82 in fiscal year 1983.

The fiscal year 1984 budget request included $2,500,000 for project 82–0–109. On May 23, 1983, the administration submitted an amended request of $47,500,000 "for the construction of facilities for the production of a new 155-millimeter nuclear artillery shell for eventual deployment in Europe."

The Department is currently in production on an 8-inch artillery warhead and the Lance missile warhead. Military leaders acknowledge that there is little, if any, military value to these weapons unless they can eventually be deployed in Europe. Uncertainty surrounds these deployment decisions and there has been no discernible progress to date. The uncertainty of deployment also applies to the 155mm artillery warhead regardless of its final capabilities.

In view of these considerations and, due to the current budget constraints, the Committee believes it is ill-advised to proceed to spend billions of dollars on the W82 at this time.

Project 82–D–108, nuclear weapons stockpile improvement, the recommendation includes $4,000,000, the same as the budget request and $2,000,000 above the House allowance. The Committee restores the House reductions in order to provide for facilities to improve the safety and security of stockpiled weapons.

Project 82–D–111, interactive graphics system, the Committee provides $8,600,000 for further introduction of computer graphics into the weapons production complex. This total is $2,600,000 more than the current level of funding and a reduction of $10,000,000 below the budget request.

MATERIALS PRODUCTION

The materials production program primarily provides the special nuclear materials used in the development, testing, and production of nuclear weapons. The Committee recommends large increases to allow the Department to continue to operate necessary production reactors, processing facilities, and support facilities. The recommendation will continue the escalated efforts to upgrade and operate the L reactor at the Savannah River plant, to produce additional quantities of weapon-grade material in the three operating Savannah River production reactors, to continue efforts for reactivation of the PUREX fuel processing facility at Hanford, and to convert the N reactor at Hanford to weapon-grade plutonium production.

The Committee recognizes that new initiatives are necessary to meet the projected requirements for special nuclear materials. The Committee recognizes that long lead times are involved in order to meet future needs. Nevertheless, the Committee is concerned that the Department has proposed several new and expensive initiatives that appear to provide only marginal supply contributions.

Because of the magnitude of the investment and lead times involved, the Department must give increased emphasis to long-term planning in the materials production program.

The availability of special nuclear materials is influenced as much by recovery of materials from weapons being retired as it is influenced by the new production of such materials. Additional attention needs to be focused on the retirement program as well as all other alternatives for meeting special materials requirements.

The Committee recommendation for materials production totals $1,525,400,000 which is $40,100,000 above the budget request and $22,640,000 over the fiscal year 1983 level.

Reactor operations.—The Committee provides $501,645,000 for reactor operations, a reduction of $20,000,000 from the budget request and

$108,945,000 over the 1983 funding. This increase provides for operation of reactor feed plants at Fernald and Ashtabula, Ohio and Oak Ridge, Tenn., the N reactor at Richland, Wash., and 4 production reactors at Savannah River, S.C.

The Committee recommends the deferral of the full implementation of the Mark-15 initiative which involves the special loading of reactors to increase plutonium production. As a result of this recommendation, which is consistent with action of the Senate Armed Services Committee, operating expenses for reaction operations are reduced by $13,500,000 and the funding for Project 83–D–180 in the amount of $6,500,000 is deferred.

Savannah River, L-Reactor Operations.—The Committee recommends a general provision in the bill which states that none of the funds appropriated by this act, or by any other act, or by any other provision of law shall be available for the purpose of restarting the L–Reactor operations of the Savannah River plant, Aiken, S.C., until such time as the Department of Energy prepares and completes an environmental impact statement pursuant to section 102(2)c of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

The Committee recognizes that serious questions have been raised about the potential health, safety, and environmental consequences of L–Reactor operations, especially the contamination of ground water in the area. Thus the Committee feels that a full environmental impact statement should be prepared and completed before the L–Reactor is either put through cold testing or put into operation. The EIS should pay particular attention to both interim and long-term options to mitigate the potential ground water and thermal impacts of L–Reactor operations.

The Committee also recognizes the importance of L–Reactor operations to the Nation's security, and thus urges the Department of Energy to begin the L–Reactor EIS without further delay. DOE also should consider ways, consistent with the provisions of the National Energy Policy Act and in consultation with State officials and the public, to expedite the preparation and completion of this environmental impact statement. In particular, the Secretary of Energy may shorten the public comment periods, providing that the public comment period is not reduced to less than 45 days. The Secretary is also encouraged to make extensive use of existing documents and information in the preparation of the EIS.

The provision adopted by the Committee requires that the Secretary of Energy shall provide his record of decision, based upon the completed EIS not later than January 1, 1984.

Processing of nuclear materials.—The Committee recommends $385,295,000 for processing of nuclear materials. This total is $20,000,000 over the budget request and $5,000,000 more than the House allowance. This allowance will provide for processing activities at Richland and Savannah River. The recommendation also provides $60,000,000 for special isotope separation, an increase of $20,000,000 over the budget request. This will restore the funding and help continue development of this technology.

Supporting services.—The Committee recommendation for supporting services totals $383,460,000 which reflects an increase of $5,150,000 compared to fiscal year 1983 and a decrease of $24,900,000 from the administration's budget request.

The Committee recommendation for operating expenses represents a $4,900,000 decrease and allows a 5-percent real growth when the fiscal year 1983 base is adjusted for the L reactor startup and PUREX reactivation. The Committee recommendation provides for a decrease of $3,000,000 to general plant projects and a decrease of $15,000,000 to restoration of production capabilities. These actions allow for a 15-percent growth in both construction projects.

Project 84–D–126, plant engineering and design, the Committee recommends deletion of the $2,000,000 budget request for design work on "projects which the Agency has under consideration for authorization request in future years." The Committee believes that project authorization should precede detailed design efforts.

Enriched materials.—The Committee recommends $140,000,000 for enriched materials necessary for fuels for the production reactors and naval reactor cores. This recommendation reflects the transfer of the funding for the enriched materials for naval reactor cores from the naval reactor development program to materials production consistent with the action of the authorizing Committee and the actions of the Congress in fiscal year 1983.

The total recommendation is $50,000,000 lower than the House allowance. This reduction reflects the deferral of the Mark-15 initiative which is consistent with the action of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Capital equipment.—The Committee recommends $97,500,000 for capital equipment, a reduction of $5,000,000 below the budget request.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommendation provides a total of $608,500,000 for defense nuclear waste activities, $3,000,000 below the budget request and $15,600,000 under the House allowance. This recommendation is $89,771,000 over the fiscal year 1983 level with most of the increase proposed for construction activities.

Project 81–T–105, defense waste facility at Savannah River, the Committee includes $142,000,000, an increase of $102,000,000 over fiscal year 1983 and the same as the House and budget request.

NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends $493,000,000 for naval reactors development, the same as the House allowance and $120,000,000 lower than the budget request. This reduction reflects the transfer of the funding of the enriched material from the naval reactors development program to the materials production program consistent with the action of Congress in fiscal year 1983.

VERIFICATION AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY

The Committee recommendation for verification and control technology provides $61,650,000, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY

The Committee recommends $52,000,000 for nuclear materials security and safeguards development within this program, the same as the House allowance and the budget request.

SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS

The recommendation includes $29,500,000 for security investigations, the same as the budget request and the House allowance.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Details of the Committee's recommendation, current year estimates, the budget request, and House allowance are shown in the following table:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES				
I. Weapons activities				
A. Research, development and testing				
1. Research and development				
Operating expenses............................	641,500	714,480	714,480	714,480
Capital equipment.............................	62,500	68,800	68,800	68,800
Construction:				
84-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	12,000	20,000	15,000	17,000
84-D-102 Radiation Hardened Integrated Circuit Lab, SNLA............................	---	---	2,000	2,000
84-D-103 Hardened central guard force facility, LANL	---	600	600	600

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-104 Nuclear materials storage facility, LANL	---	700	700	700
83-D-199 Buffer land acquisition LLNL	---	---	7,000	---
83-D-122 Los Alamos airport improvement, LANL	3,100	---	---	---
82-D-144 Simulation technology laboratory, SNLA	3,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
82-D-150 Weapons materials research and development facility, LLNL	5,000	2,900	2,900	2,900
82-D-152 New detonator facility, LANL	7,500	---	---	5,600
82-D-153 Tritium facility, LANL	1,600	---	---	---
81-D-133 Earthquake damage restoration, LLNL, CA	1,500	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-D-134 Earthquake damage restoration, SNLL, CA..................................	1,700	---	---	---
79-7-C Proton storage ring, LAML, NM.........	2,800	---	---	---
78-16-G Radioactive liquid waste improvement, LAML, NM..................................	---	3,500	3,500	3,500
Subtotal, Construction.......................	38,200	35,700	39,700	40,300
Subtotal, Research and development...............	742,200	818,980	822,980	823,580
2. Testing				
Operating expenses...........................	408,300	475,900	475,900	475,900
Capital equipment............................	30,500	39,600	39,600	39,600
Construction:				
84-D-101 General plant projects, various locations	3,800	7,100	4,600	7,100

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-107 Nuclear test facilities revitalization, various locations	---	38,500	38,500	23,500
Subtotal Construction	3,800	45,600	43,100	30,600
Subtotal, Testing	442,600	561,100	558,600	546,100
Subtotal, Research, development and testing	1,184,800	1,380,080	1,381,580	1,369,680
B. Inertial confinement fusion				
Operating expenses	140,000	127,100	154,000	127,100
Capital equipment	11,000	11,800	11,800	11,800
Construction:				
81-D-101 Particle beam fusion accelerator-II SNL, NM	4,250	12,900	12,900	12,900

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
78-4-A High energy laser facility (NOVA) LLNL, CA	34,500	---	---	---
Subtotal, Inertial confinement fusion	189,750	151,800	178,700	151,800
C. Production and surveillance				
Operating expenses	1,474,500	1,779,715	1,621,915	1,711,915
Capital equipment	92,000	114,400	114,400	106,400
Construction:				
84-D-111 General plant projects	16,300	29,500	20,000	25,000
84-D-112 TRIDENT II warhead production facilities, various locations	---	19,300	- -	19,300
84-D-113 Antisubmarine warfare/standoff weapon warhead prod facs, var locations	---	17,600	---	---
84-D-114 Consolidated nonnuclear manufacturing facility, Rocky Flats, CO	---	24,100	24,100	24,100

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
84-D-115 Electrical system expansion, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	1,500	1,500	1,500
84-D-117 Inert assembly & test facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	1,500	1,500	1,500
84-D-118 High explosive subassembly facility, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	7,000	7,000	7,000
84-D-119 Railroad track replacement and upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	---	800	800	800
84-D-120 Explosive component test facility, Mound Laboratory, Miamisburg, OH	---	13,100	13,100	3,100
84-D-121 Safeguards and security upgrade, Rocky Flats, Co............................	---	10,000	10,000	10,000
83-D-124 Standard missile-2 (SM-2) warhead production facilities, various locations.....	2,000	3,000	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-D-134 SENTRY (LoADS) warhead production facility, various locations	---	16,300	---	---
82-D-106 Weapon assembly facilities, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	16,500	---	---	---
82-D-107 Utilities & equip restoration, replace & upgrade, Phase III, var locations	154,400	229,200	185,000	185,000
82-D-108 Nuclear weapons stockpile improvement, various locations	33,300	4,000	2,000	4,000
82-D-109 155mm artillery fired atomic projectile (AFAP) prod facs, var locations	---	50,000	50,000	---
82-D-111 Interactive graphics system, various locations ($9M auth FY82)	6,000	18,600	18,600	8,600
82-D-146 Weapons prod & prod support facs, various locations	40,000	14,200	14,200	14,200

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-D-115 MX warhead prod facs, various locations	60,000	30,000	20,000	30,000
81-D-120 Control of effluents & pollutants, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	---	1,000	1,000	1,000
78-16-A Cruise missile production facilities various, locations	16,000	---	---	---
78-17-D Steam plant improvements, Y-12 Plant Oak Ridge, TN	6,000	---	---	---
Inflation Estimates	-16,100	---	---	---
Unobligated balances	---	---	-20,000	---
Subtotal, Construction	334,400	490,700	348,800	335,100
Subtotal, Production and surveillance	1,900,900	2,384,815	2,085,115	2,153,415

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
D. Program direction				
Operating expenses				
1. Weapons program	50,091	55,930	55,930	55,930
Subtotal, Weapons activities	3,325,541	3,972,625	3,701,325	3,730,825
(Operating expenses)	(2,714,391)	(3,153,125)	(3,022,225)	(3,085,325)
(Plant and Capital)	(611,150)	(819,500)	(679,100)	(645,500)
II. Materials production				
A. Reactor operations				
Operating expenses	331,000	497,745	497,745	484,245
Construction:				
83-D-180 Facility storage modifications, various locations	9,300	6,500	6,500	---
83-D-146 Water pollution control, FMPC, Fernald, Ohio	1,400	4,000	4,000	4,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-D-126 Reactor safety and reliability, various locations...........................	9,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
81-D-142 Steam transfer header, Savannah River Plant, SC............................	5,500	7,400	7,400	7,400
81-D-143 L-reactor upgrade, Savannah River, SC..................................	36,500	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction........................	61,700	23,900	23,900	17,400
Subtotal, Reactor operations......................	392,700	521,645	521,645	501,645
B. Processing of nuclear materials				
Operating expenses - Processing of nuc. mat..	203,150	287,595	287,595	287,595
Operating expenses - Special isotope sep. res	59,000	40,000	40,000	60,000
Subtotal Operating expenses....................	262,150	327,595	327,595	347,595

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
84-D-130 Modification processing facility substation, Savannah River, SC................	---	5,600	5,600	5,600
84-D-135 Process Facility Modifications Purex......................................	---	---	15,000	---
83-D-142 Fuel dissolver off-gas transfer and treatment system, IFPF, INEL, ID.............	3,500	4,100	4,100	4,100
82-D-201 Special plutonium recovery facs, F-chem separations area, Savannah River, SC....	11,000	26,000	26,000	26,000
81-D-126 Pollution abatement facilities-chemical processing plants, Richland, WA.....	2,700	---	---	---
81-D-131 Remote analytical facility upgrade and expansion, IFPF, INEL, ID................	10,500	2,000	2,000	2,000
81-T-502 Advanced isotope separation lab, LLNL, CA..................................	7,200	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
80-AE-2 Replace obsolete processing facs., HB-Line, Savannah River, SC	3,000	---	---	---
77-13-A Fluorinel dissolution process & fuel receiving improve, IFPF, INEL, ID	10,000	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	47,900	37,700	52,700	37,700
Subtotal, Processing of nuclear materials	310,050	365,295	380,295	385,295
C. Supporting services				
Operating expenses	220,260	212,860	202,960	207,960
Construction:				
84-D-125 General plant projects	26,000	31,000	28,000	28,000
84-D-126 Plant engineering and design	2,000	2,000	2,000	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
83-D-138 Purex canyon & dissolver filter systems improvements, Richland, WA...........	4,250	8,500	8,500	8,500
83-D-147 Pollution discharge elimination, Savannah River, SC...........................	1,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC..............	1,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
82-D-118 N-reactor plant security and surveillance, Richland, WA..................	500	2,400	2,400	2,400
82-D-124 Restoration of production capabilities, Phases II & III, var locations ...	89,700	118,600	108,000	103,600
82-D-127 Safeguards improvements, Savannah River Plant, SC.............................	1,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
82-D-128 Plant perimeter security systems upgrade, IFPF, INEL, IDAHO..................	---	3,000	3,000	3,000

S.Rept. 98-153 --- 12

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
82-D-136 Fuel processing facilities upgrade, IFPF, INEL, Idaho	17,500	18,000	18,000	18,000
81-D-128 Restoration of production capabilities, Phase I, various locations	15,100	---	---	---
Subtotal, Construction	158,050	195,500	181,900	175,500
Subtotal, Supporting services	378,310	408,360	384,860	383,460
D. Enriched materials	---	70,000	190,000	140,000
E. Capital equipment	107,700	102,500	102,500	97,500
F. Program direction	14,000	17,500	17,500	17,500
Subtotal, Materials production	1,202,760	1,485,300	1,596,800	1,525,400
(Operating expenses)	(827,410)	(1,125,700)	(1,235,800)	(1,197,300)
(Plant and Capital)	(375,350)	(359,600)	(361,000)	(328,100)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
III. Defense waste and by-products management				
A. Interim waste management				
Operating expenses...........................	200,968	221,026	221,026	221,026
Construction:				
84-D-150 General plant projects, various locations	19,145	25,830	22,830	22,830
83-D-157 Additional radioactive waste storage facilities, Richland, WA....................	19,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
82-N-103 Waste handling & isolation facs, Richland, WA................................	7,000	3,570	3,570	3,570
82-N-104 Waste transfer facilities, Richland, WA..	2,750	---	---	---
82-N-107 Rail replacement/Hanford railroad, Richland, WA................................	6,000	3,000	3,000	3,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-T-104 Radioactive waste facs. improves., ORNL, Oak Ridge, TN	5,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Subtotal, Construction	58,895	67,400	64,400	64,400
Subtotal, Interim waste management	259,863	288,426	285,426	285,426
B. Long-term waste management technology				
Operating expenses	54,961	64,604	64,604	64,604
Construction:				
83-D-159 General plant projects	500	---	---	---
82-Bu-1 Byproducts beneficial uses demo plants, VL	5,000	---	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
81-T-105 Defense waste processing facilities, Savannah River, SC	40,000	142,000	142,000	142,000
Subtotal, Construction	45,500	142,000	142,000	142,000
Subtotal, Long-term waste management technology	100,461	206,604	206,604	206,604
C. Terminal storage				
Operating expenses	14,000	20,800	20,800	20,800
Construction:				
77-13-F Waste isolation pilot plant, Delaware Basin, Southeast, NM	110,800	59,300	59,300	59,300
Subtotal, Terminal storage	124,800	80,100	80,100	80,100
D. Byproducts and Beneficial use				
Operating expenses	---	---	10,000	---

Departmental Administration

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$381,482,000
Budget estimate, 1984	346,510,000
House allowance	366,075,000
Committee recommendation	356,075,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+9,565,000
House allowance	−10,000,000

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriations, 1983	$15,593,000
Budget estimate, 1984	4,981,000
House allowance	4,981,000
Committee recommendation	4,981,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends a net appropriation of $151,437,000 for departmental administration which is $9,565,000 above the budget request and $10,000,000 below the House allowance.

The administration has proposed to reorganize the Department of Energy. At the time the Committee considered the fiscal year 1984 budget from the Department, however, no legislative proposal to accomplish this reorganization had been submitted to the Congress. Consequently, the Committee is compelled to once again restore funds that are essential for the maintenance of critical functions of the Department without the benefit of a formal budget amendment. It is unrealistic to assume that the Secretary of Energy will be able to carry out his responsibilities, operational as well as developmental, without sufficient funding and personnel to match program levels.

The Department has submitted a proposal, to increase the fiscal year 1984 budget and the Committee recommendation is based on the OMB-approved funding level.

Indian Affairs program.—The Committee recommendation provides $1,000,000 from this account for the Council of Resource Tribes (CERT).

The following tables show the Committee recommendations by program for new (budget) obligational authority in comparison to the current year, the budget estimate, and the House allowance.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Construction:				
84-D-200 Byproducts beneficial use demo plant, various locations................	---	---	5,000	---
E. Capital equipment............................	31,605	33,900	34,500	33,900
F. Program direction............................	2,000	2,470	2,470	2,470
Subtotal, Defense waste & by-products management.	518,729	611,500	624,100	608,500
(Operating expenses)............................	(271,929)	(308,900)	(318,900)	(308,900)
(Plant and Capital)............................	(246,800)	(302,600)	(305,200)	(299,600)
IV. Naval reactors development				
A. Plant development				
Operating expenses............................	58,000	59,000	59,000	59,000

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
B. Reactor development				
Operating expenses	157,150	188,800	188,800	188,800
Construction:				
84-N-101 General plant projects	1,500	2,500	2,500	2,500
83-N-102 Additions to radioactive materials laboratory, Schenectady, NY	1,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
82-N-111 Materials facility, Savannah River, SC	40,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
81-T-112 Mods. and additions to prototype facs, various locations	35,000	24,000	24,000	24,000
Subtotal, Construction	78,000	103,000	103,000	103,000
Subtotal, Reactor development	235,150	291,800	291,800	291,800

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Reactor operation and evaluation				
Operating expenses	104,100	112,000	112,000	112,000
D. Enriched material	109,000	120,000	---	---
E. Capital equipment	11,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
F. Program direction	9,660	10,200	10,200	10,200
Subtotal, Naval reactors development	526,910	613,000	493,000	493,000
(Operating expenses)	(437,910)	(490,000)	(370,000)	(370,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(89,000)	(123,000)	(123,000)	(123,000)
V. Other atomic energy defense activities				
A. Verification and control technology				
Operating expenses	50,600	57,150	57,150	57,150

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Capital equipment	1,500	1,750	1,750	1,750
Program direction	1,800	2,750	2,750	2,750
Subtotal, Verification and control technology	53,900	61,650	61,650	61,650
(Operating expenses)	(52,400)	(59,900)	(59,900)	(59,900)
(Plant and Capital)	(1,500)	(1,750)	(1,750)	(1,750)
B. Nuclear safeguards and security				
Operating expenses	37,310	41,650	41,650	41,650
Capital equipment	3,700	4,000	4,000	4,000
Construction:				
83-D-175 General plant projects	500	---	---	---
Program direction	5,850	6,350	6,350	6,350
Subtotal Nuclear safeguards and security	47,360	52,000	52,000	52,000
(Operating expenses)	(43,160)	(48,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)
(Plant and Capital)	(4,200)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
C. Security investigations - OE...................	28,500	29,500	29,500	29,500
Subtotal Other atomic energy defense activities..	129,760	143,150	143,150	143,150
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES...............	5,703,700	6,825,575	6,558,375	6,500,875
(Operating expenses)..................................	(4,375,700)	(5,215,125)	(5,084,325)	(5,098,925)
(Plant and Capital)..................................	(1,328,000)	(1,610,450)	(1,474,050)	(1,401,950)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION				
I. Office of the Secretary - Salaries and expenses				
A. Office of the Secretary	864	647	954	954
B. Other expenses	361	280	348	348
Subtotal, Office of the Secretary - OE	1,225	927	1,302	1,302
II. General management - salaries				
A. Board of Contract Appeals	238	261	261	261
B. General Counsel	9,855	8,727	10,795	10,795
C. Inspector General	6,102	7,071	7,071	7,071
D. A/S Management & Administration	31,775	28,799	36,660	36,660
E. A/S Cons., Intergov. & Public Affairs	4,818	1,990	4,818	4,818
F. A/S Conservation and Renewable Energy	343	441	498	498
G. Regional / Operations Offices	58,799	46,529	57,569	57,569
H. Policy, Planning & Analysis	2,910	1,323	1,940	1,940

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

Section 302(a) of Public Law 95–91 transferred to the Department of Energy the power marketing functions under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 and all other functions of the Department of the Interior with respect to the Alaska Power Administration, Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the power marketing functions of the Bureau of Reclamation including the transmission and disposition of electric power and energy from Falcon and Amistad Dams, now included in the Western Area Power Administration.

Bonneville Power operations are self-financing under authority of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act of 1974. The act authorizes Bonneville Power to use its revenues to finance operating costs, capital construction and to sell bonds to the Treasury if necessary to finance any remaining capital program requirements.

All other power marketing administrations are funded annually in appropriations and related receipts are deposited in the Treasury. In fiscal year 1984, these receipts are estimated by the DOE to total $396,100,000, compared to $294,100,000 in fiscal year 1983.

The following table summarizes the appropriations recommended for the power marketing administrations.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
I. A/S International Affairs	1,964	1,170	1,872	1,872
J. Office of Minority Economic Impact	429	429	429	429
Subtotal, Salaries	117,233	96,740	121,913	121,913
III. General management - other expenses				
A. Other salary expenses - OE	9,265	6,422	8,800	8,800
B. Benefits	17,028	14,491	15,662	15,662
C. Travel	5,110	4,816	5,178	5,178
D. Services	113,470	100,536	110,642	110,642
E. Workmens compensation	1,320	1,387	1,387	1,387
F. Minority Economic Impact studies	1,400	1,100	1,100	1,100
G. Capital equipment	2,900	4,981	4,981	4,981
Subtotal, Other expenses	150,493	133,733	147,750	147,750
(Operating expenses)	(147,593)	(128,752)	(142,769)	(142,769)
(Plant and Capital)	(2,900)	(4,981)	(4,981)	(4,981)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
IV. Program Support				
A. Policy analysis and system studies - OE.......	5,613	3,500	3,500	3,500
B. Intergovernmental and Institutional Relations				
Consumer Affairs - OE..........................	100	---	---	---
Public Affairs - OE............................	103	150	150	150
Competition - OE...............................	100	---	---	---
Subtotal, Intergov, & Institutional Relations....	303	150	150	150
C. International Policy Studies - OE.............	250	250	250	250
D. Cost of work for others.......................	109,265	116,191	116,191	116,191
Subtotal, Program support........................	115,431	120,091	120,091	120,091

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
V. Miscellaneous revenues..........................	-175,541	-209,619	-209,619	-209,619
Continuing resolution unapplied (PACE)...........	12,693	---	---	---
FY 1983 Deferred balance carried forward.........	---	---	-20,000	-30,000
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION....................	221,534	141,872	161,437	151,437
(Operating expenses)................................	(381,482)	(346,510)	(366,075)	(356,075)
(Miscellaneous revenues)............................	(-175,541)	(-209,619)	(-209,619)	(-209,619)
(Plant and Capital)................................	(15,593)	(4,981)	(4,981)	(4,981)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Alaska Power Administration				
A. Operating expenses	2,657	2,469	2,469	2,469
B. General investigation	640	100	100	100
D. Program direction	648	641	641	641
E. Emergency fund	---	---	200	200
TOTAL ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,945	3,210	3,410	3,410
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION				
I. Power marketing - Bonneville Administration	249,500	203,500	123,400	123,400
Permanent authority to borrow	(205,500)	(201,100)	(201,100)	---
TOTAL BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION	249,500	203,500	123,400	123,400

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southeastern power administration				
A. Operating and maintenance	1,500	1,751	1,751	1,751
B. Purchase power and wheeling	2,464	18,843	18,843	18,843
TOTAL SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	3,964	20,594	20,594	20,594
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Southwestern Power Administration				
A. Operation and maintenance	9,070	9,800	9,800	9,800
B. Purchase power and wheeling	7,156	22,729	22,729	22,729
C. Construction	4,530	3,700	3,700	3,700
TOTAL SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION	20,756	36,229	36,229	36,229

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION - CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE				
I. Power marketing - Western Area Power Administration				
A. Construction and rehabilitation..................	71,786	78,767	78,767	78,767
B. System operation and maintenance................	52,800	72,863	72,863	72,863
C. Purchase power and wheeling.....................	25,164	68,000	68,000	68,000
Unobligated balances............................	---	---	-35,000	-15,000
TOTAL WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION..............	149,750	219,630	184,630	204,630
EMERGENCY FUND - WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION				
I. Emergency fund....................................	337	500	500	500
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION.............	150,087	220,130	185,130	205,130

ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1983	$3,945,000
Budget estimate, 1984	3,210,000
House allowance	3,410,000
Committee recommendation	3,410,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+200,000
House allowance	

An appropriation of $3,410,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same as the House allowance and $200,000 over the budget request.

The Alaska Power Administration operates, maintains, and markets power for the two Federal hydroelectric projects in Alaska, and conducts investigations of future water and power resource developments and power system studies. Program objectives include: maximizing benefits and protecting investments for the operating projects, and contributing, through the investigative programs, to use and development of renewable energy sources, such as hydroelectric, for Alaska's power needs. The State's power systems are presently dependent on oil and natural gas for over 75 percent of energy requirements; demands are increasing rapidly; and opportunities exist to shift to coal and hydroelectric resources using environmentally sound projects. Revenues from power marketing are delivered to the Treasury and are expected to total $6,100,000 in fiscal year 1984. This reflects an increase of about $1,700,000 over the fiscal 1983 estimate.

The Administration has proposed that an indefinite amount be available in case of an emergency. The Committee is sympathetic to the need for a fund to be used in case of an emergency such as the failure of transmission line towers that occurred in fiscal year 1982. However, the Committee recommends a specific amount of $200,000, to remain available until expended, rather than the indefinite amount requested. This recommendation is consistent with that originally requested by the Alaska Power Administration. The Committee directs that any use of this fund be promptly reported to the applicable congressional committees.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

BORROWING AUTHORITY

Appropriations, 1983	$249,500,000
Budget estimate, 1984	203,500,000
House allowance	123,400,000
Committee recommendation	123,400,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−80,100,000
House allowance	

LIMITATION ON DIRECT LOANS

Appropriations, 1983	....
Budget estimate, 1984	$40,000,000
House allowance	40,000,000
Committee recommendation	40,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	....
House allowance	....

LIMITATION OF GUARANTEED LOANS

Appropriations, 1983	....
Budget estimate, 1984	$20,000,000
House allowance	20,000,000
Committee recommendation	20,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	....
House allowance	....

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is the Federal electric power marketing agency for the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS), which consists of the hydroelectric generating facilities in the Pacific Northwest of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior (30 projects at present), plus BPA's transmission system of more than 12,794 circuit-miles of high-voltage transmission lines and 350 substations. BPA markets about one-half of the electric power produced in the Northwest and provides about four-fifths of the region's bulk electric power transmission capacity. Also, BPA markets and exchanges electric power interregionally over the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie, and in Canada over interconnections with utilities in British Columbia.

BPA operates on a self-financing basis, thus requiring no appropriations. However, BPA's fiscal year 1984 budget reflects the need for borrowing authority of $324,500,000 to carry out the proposed program and new responsibilities pursuant to Public Law 96–501, the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act. BPA estimates that in addition to the $201,100,000 in borrowing authority under Public Law 93–454 and Public Law 96–501, there is a fiscal year 1984 requirement for new borrowing authority in the amount of $123,400,000. The Committee includes language, as proposed in the budget request, to provide an increase of $1,250,000,000 in additional borrowing authority which will be used to finance multiyear investments in transmission system construction as well as other responsibilities of the Administrator. The budget reflects estimates of borrowing authority usage required for each year, and the Committee includes an estimate of the new borrowing authority which will be required for fiscal year 1984.

The recommended limitation on direct loans and loan guarantees are the same, as recommended by the administration and the House. BPA indicates that this level is adequate to carry out its responsibilities as required by law.

Southeastern Power Administration

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1983	$3,964,000
Budget estimate, 1984	20,594,000
House allowance	20,594,000
Committee recommendation	20,594,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $20,594,000, which is the same as the budget request.

The Southeastern Power Administration (SEPA) markets hydroelectric power produced at Federal projects located in 10 Southeastern States in accordance with policy directives contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. The States include Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi.

Southeastern now markets power from 21 Federal dams in the Southeast with a combined capacity of 2,712 megawatts. The power is currently sold to 199 wholesale customers.

As of the end of fiscal year 1982, the cumulative Federal investment in SEPA projects totaled $1,007,000,000. Of this, $259,000,000 had been repaid to the Treasury with interest totaling $376,000,000, leaving an unrepaid investment of $748,000,000.

The large increase over the 1983 appropriation is the result of the elimination of the net-billing procedures used in prior years. The increase in wheeling cost of $16,379,000, however, will be offset by an increase of $19,900,000 in revenues deposited to the Treasury.

Southwestern Power Administration

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1983	$20,756,000
Budget estimate, 1984	36,229,000
House allowance	36,229,000
Committee recommendation	36,229,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends concurrence with the budget request of $36,229,000.

The Southwestern Power Administration (SWPA) is the marketing agent for the disposal of power and energy generated at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' hydroelectric plants in the six-State area of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana. It is headquartered in Tulsa, Okla., with an operation control center located in Springfield, Mo., and maintenance crews and support warehouses located in Muskogee and Ada, Okla.; Jonesboro, Ark.; and Springfield, Mo.

The SWPA provides transmission lines, substations, switching stations, and communication facilities for integration and optimal distribution of electricity from hydroelectric projects for transmission and sale of power to geographically dispersed customers.

The SWPA schedules and controls the generation of power from 22 hydroelectric projects to 65 contracts from 59 system interconnection points with publicly and privately owned utilities. In addition, the SWPA operates and maintains 1,665 miles of transmission lines consisting of 161kV, 138kV and 69kV wood pole and steel construction. It performs maintenance on 20 radio and microwave stations, 12 switching and 20 substations, with a total installed capacity of 2,089,000 kVA.

The cumulative Federal investment in power generation and transmission facilities assigned to SWPA totals $725,000,000. Repayments through fiscal year 1982 totaled $31,000,000 along with interest of $322,000,000.

Southwestern's gross revenues for fiscal year 1984 are estimated to total $91,500,000, compared to $66,200,000 in fiscal year 1983.

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriations, 1983	$149,750,000
Budget estimate, 1984	219,630,000
House allowance	184,630,000
Committee recommendation	204,630,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	−15,000,000
House allowance	+20,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $204,630,000, the same as the budget request.

The Construction, Rehabilitation, Operation and Maintenance program of the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA), excluding the Colorado River storage project and Fort Peck project, involves marketing federally generated hydroelectric power within a 15-State area in the West.

Western is responsible for the operation and maintenance of about 16,000 miles of transmission lines and over 200 substations. Electric power marketed by Western is generated by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the International Boundary and Water Commission in Texas, all of which operate some 49 hydropower generating plants in Western's service area with a current installed generating capacity of 8,466,353 kilowatts.

Western, through its power marketing program, must secure revenues sufficient to meet the annual costs of operation and maintenance of the generating and transmission facilities, purchased power, wheeling and other expenses, in order to repay all of the power investment with interest, and to repay that portion of the Government's irrigation and other nonpower investments which are beyond the water users' repayment capability. Under the Colorado River Basins power marketing fund, which encompasses the Colorado River Basin, Fort Peck, and Colorado River storage projects, all operation and maintenance and power marketing expenses are financed from revenues.

The cumulative Federal investment in power generation and transmission facilities assigned to WAPA through fiscal year 1981 is $3,736,000,000. Repayments totaled $1,298,000,000 along with interest of $923,000,000, leaving an unrepaid investment of $2,438,000,000. With recent rate increases, WAPA's repayment status is generally satisfactory except for one or two projects where additional rate action may be needed.

WAPA gross revenues for fiscal year 1984 are estimated to total $545,927,000, compared to $453,555,000 in fiscal year 1983.

The Committee recommendation restores a portion of the House reduction to WAPA's 1984 program. The Committee believes that a cut of the level recommended by the House would have an unacceptable adverse impact on Western's ability to efficiently and responsibly carry out their power marketing functions.

The Committee is aware of the need for additional transmission facilities in western Colorado. The proposed western Colorado line is cosponsored with non-Federal interests and involves a permit process that must precede construction as a joint participation project. The Committee has learned, however, that delays in the permit process have occurred and will probably continue. Unfortunately, WAPA will also continue to suffer high transmission losses, inadequate power transfer capability, and increasing system vulnerability. Therefore, the Committee wishes to clarify that, although the Committee prefers joint participation, funding provided to WAPA may be utilized to independently construct transmission facilities in western Colorado and is not restricted to use in a joint participation approach.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$86,139,000
Budget estimate, 1984	94,582,000
House allowance	89,582,000
Committee recommendation	94,582,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	....
House allowance	+5,000,000

REVENUES APPLIED

Revenues applied, 1983	....
Budget estimate, 1984	−$60,000,000
House allowance	−60,000,000
Committee recommendation	−60,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	....
House allowance	....

NET APPROPRIATION

Appropriations, 1983	$86,139,000
Budget estimate, 1984	34,582,000
House allowance	29,582,000
Committee recommendation	34,582,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	....
House allowance	+5,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $94,582,000, which is the same as the budget request and $5,000,000 over the House allowance.

Section 204 and title IV of Public Law 95–91, the Department of Energy Organization Act, established within the Department of Energy the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out functions transferred from the Federal Power Commission for hydroelectric, electric utility, and natural gas regulation and from the Interstate Commerce Commission for oil pipeline regulation.

The act sets out the clear intent of Congress that the Commission be independent from supervision or direction from any other officer of the Department, but provides that the Secretary shall provide to the Commission such support and facilities as the Commission determines it needs to carry out its functions. This support includes services for personnel, accounting, facilities support, computer operations, procurement, and other similar services funded elsewhere in the Departmental request.

As in past years, the Committee continues to encourage the Commission to give full and fair hearings to all points of view, and to keep the public informed of its activities. The Committee believes, however, that the Commission itself is charged by law with representing the public interest and feels it would be counterproductive to pay with Federal funds the expenses of special interest groups reflecting a particular point of view. Therefore, the appropriation included in the bill does not provide for funding intervenor actions.

FERC User Fees.—The administration's budget proposed that FERC be required to collect $60,000,000 from revised fee schedules and retain those revenues to offset their program operating expenses. It is the Committee's intention that no new fees, inspection services or other services be established or created as a result of this provision, and that only those fees currently authorized in law be used as a source of revenues. The administration's intention is to reduce actual Federal regulatory expenses and to more closely relate costs with revenues. While the intention of the proposal is consistent with other revenue-generating activities of the Federal Government, including several in this appropriation bill, the manner in which this would be applied to FERC could have unanticipated and undesirable impacts on FERC's responsibilities. Because of this, the Committee recommendation revises the proposed appropriation language to provide that estimated revenues could be retained and used to offset FERC expanses, but the full recommended total budget authority is available to the Agency at the beginning of the fiscal year and would be reduced only as revenues become available during the fiscal year. The revised language, furthermore, provides only for "estimated revenues" so that if FERC is unable to actually collect the $60,000,000 in fees, then their program and activities will not be reduced as a result of this. Conversely, if more than $60,000,000 is collected, this will further reduce the amount of appropriated funds collected.

The Committee does not concur with the House Committee report regarding small-scale hydroelectric study.

The following table summarizes the Committee action:

GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND

GEOTHERMAL LOAN GUARANTEE AND INTEREST ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1983	
Budget estimate, 1984	$2,100,000
House allowance	2,100,000
Committee recommendation	2,100,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,100,000. This is the same as the budget request and the same as the House allowance.

The geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program is authorized under the Geothermal Energy Research, Development, and Demonstration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–410), as amended by the Department of Energy Act of 1978—Civilian Applications (Public Law 95–238).

The purpose of the program is to accelerate the commercial development and utilization of geothermal energy. Loan guarantees approved under this program are expected to achieve (1) development of normal borrower-lender relationships which, through experience, will encourage the flow of credit without further dependence on Federal financial assistance and (2) enhanced competition to encourage new contracts into the geothermal market.

The Committee considers it reasonable that the DOE should be flexible in its approach to restructuring geothermal loan guarantees where economic trends and experience with the resource indicate that such restructuring would improve the viability of the project and, therefore, bolster the prospects for the success of the loan guarantee program.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$2,900,000
Budget estimate, 1984	
House allowance	2,500,000
Committee recommendation	2,700,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+2,700,000
House allowance	+200,000

An appropriation of $2,700,000 is recommended for salaries and expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission. This is $300,000 over the amount recommended by the House.

The salaries and expenses appropriation finances the full cost of the Federal cochairman and his immediate staff and 50 percent of the administrative expenses of the Commission. The recommendation provides for the same personnel level as in 1982 necessary to administer ARC programs at a reduced level, and reflects reduced operating levels consistent with the phase-down program.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations, 1983	[1] $165,133,000
Budget estimate, 1984	[2] 80,000,000
House allowance	150,000,000
Committee recommendation	125,000,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+45,000,000
House allowance	−25,000,000

[1] Appropriations based on 1982 rate of funding provided in the Continuing Resolution for Fiscal Year 1983.
[2] Included under Department of Transportation, "Federal Highway Administration."

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $125,000,000 for the Appalachian Regional Development programs. The recommended program level provides the full budget request of $80,000,000 for the highway program; $5,000,000 for local development districts and technical assistance; and $40,000,000 for area development programs.

The Committee is aware that the President again has not included funding in his fiscal 1984 budget for area development programs and activities of the Appalachian Regional Commission. However, recognizing the importance of ARC programs to that region and past Senate action to continue funding for these programs, the Committee has rec-

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION				
I. Oil pipeline regulation	6,199	6,682	6,682	6,682
II. Natural gas regulation				
A. Pipeline certificate regulation	14,300	15,644	15,644	15,644
B. Pipeline rate regulation	12,924	14,062	14,062	14,062
C. Producer certificate regulation	2,300	2,478	2,478	2,478
D. Producer rate regulation	3,546	3,837	3,837	3,837
E. Wellhead pricing	6,915	7,498	7,498	7,498
Subtotal, Natural gas regulation	39,985	43,519	43,519	43,519
III. Hydro power licensing	21,849	24,707	24,707	24,707
IV. Electric power regulation	18,106	19,674	19,674	19,674
General reduction	---	---	-5,000	---
SUBTOTAL, FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION	86,139	94,582	89,582	94,582

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Project title (1)	Current year enacted (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Senate allowance (5)
Adjustments:				
Less offsetting revenues	---	-60,000	-60,000	-60,000
TOTAL, FERC AFTER REVENUES	86,139	34,582	29,582	34,582

ommended a funding level of $125,000,000 which is $45,000,000 over the President's budget request.

Two years ago, the Congress began a phasedown of ARC programs and activities and the recommendation here continues in that direction. The Committee feels that the finish-up programs should occur over the next 3 to 5 years and that program emphasis be placed in those distressed counties of the region where there is the lack of basic facilities and services, and the extension of basic health care to those counties now without it. The Committee agrees that $15,000,000 of the area development funds should be spent on projects in distressed counties as proposed by the region's Governor.

In an effort to insure maximum effectiveness and an orderly phasedown of ARC area development programs, the Committee directs that not to exceed 50 percent of the total cost of an activity be financed by ARC, except in distressed counties; and encourage the initiation of only those projects where funds can be expended within 1 year.

Notwithstanding the provision of section 224(b)(2) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, the Committee favorably views trends in the region to rehabilitate industrial plants and buildings for nurturing the development of small business and job creation in Appalachia.

The importance of the Appalachian highway system to the economic development of the region has been clearly demonstrated and the Committee feels the finish-up allocation should be made based on need, each segment's contribution to the economic well being of the area, and the State's uncompleted portion of the 2,383-mile highway finish-up program. The Committee views with alarm the continued addition of mileage to the Governor's highway finish-up program.

This Committee continues to take the position that because of the importance of the Appalachian highway system to the economc well being of the region, earmarking of highway funds is counterproductive, ignores the needs of the other Appalachian States, and, therefore, should be avoided.

Finally, the Committee acknowledges the formation of the Appalachian Foundation and endorses the investment of the private sector in solving the region's problems.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds recommended along with the House allowance and budget request:

[In thousands of dollars]

	1983 appropriation	1984 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Appalachian highways	115,133	[1]80,000	100,000	80,000
Area development programs	45,000		50,000	40,000
Local development districts and technical assistance	5,000			5,000
Total appropriation	165,133	80,000	150,000	125,000
Less 3 percent general reduction			−4,500	
Total program	165,133	80,000	145,500	125,000

[1] Included under Department of Transportation, "Federal Highway Administration" budget request.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$241,000
Budget estimate, 1984	191,000
House allowance	191,000
Committee recommendation	191,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee concurs with the House allowance of $191,000, the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides the full budget estimate for salaries and expenses of the U.S. Commissioner and his staff in representing interests of the Federal Government in the Delaware River Basin Commission.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1983	$269,000
Budget estimate, 1984	269,000
House allowance	269,000
Committee recommendation	269,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $269,000, which is the same as the budget request.

This appropriation provides for the Federal share of the annual expenses of the Commission.

Susquehanna River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	
Budget estimate, 1984	
House allowance	$191,000
Committee recommendation	191,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+191,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends $191,000 for salaries and expenses of the Susquehanna River Basin Commission, which is the same as the House allowance.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriations, 1983	$217,000
Budget estimate, 1984	230,000
House allowance	230,000
Committee recommendation	230,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $230,000 which is the same as the House allowance and budget request.

Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

CONTRIBUTION TO INTERSTATE COMMISSION ON THE POTOMAC RIVER BASIN

Appropriations, 1983	$55,000
Budget estimate, 1984	
House allowance	68,000
Committee recommendation	68,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+68,000
House allowance	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $68,000 for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was created in 1940 by compact among the four States in the basin, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, plus the District of Columbia and Federal Government. The Commission has the responsibility for basinwide water quality, planning, program coordination and assistance.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriations, 1983	$462,504,000
Budget estimate, 1984	466,800,000
House allowance	465,800,000
Committee recommendation	466,800,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	
House allowance	+1,000,000

An appropriation of $466,800,000 is recommended by the Committee. This is the same amount as the budget request and $1,000,000 over the House allowance.

The recommended funding provides for the necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Atomic Energy Act, as amended. It reflects a decrease in real terms compared to fiscal 1983, primarily in nuclear regulatory research programs and, to a lesser extent, in the nuclear reactor regulation programs.

Nuclear data link.—The Committee recommendation restores the House reduction and includes the requested funding for the nuclear data link system.

High temperature gas reactor.—The orderly development of the high temperature gas reactor (HTGR) requires concurrent development of the regulatory framework. Therefore, the Committee urges NRC to proceed in an expeditious way and to use budget resources to coordinate HTGR licensing activities with DOE and the private sector.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriations, 1983	$216,433,000
Budget estimate, 1984	[1]61,229,000
House allowance	[1]78,679,000
Committee recommendation	[1]75,229,000
Comparison:	
Budget estimate	+14,000,000
House allowance	−3,450,000

[1] Does not include $47,271,000 of deferred prior year appropriations.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $122,500,000, which is $3,450,000 under the House allowance and $14,000,000 over the budget request.

The Committee concurs with the House action and has restored the $14,000,000 reduction of "Jobs Bill" funding proposed by the administration.

On May 18, 1983, we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the signing of the act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority. Much has been accomplished over the past 50 years that benefits not only the people of the Tennessee Valley region, but other regions of the country and other nations around the world as well. The fertilizer development program is a prime example of how a regional TVA activity can provide significant benefits around the world.

This Committee has a long history of support for the Tennessee Valley Authority. We reaffirm that support on its 50th birthday and recognize that TVA programs continue to be of enormous benefit.

The hearings on the 1984 budget brought to light several instances where funds justified and included in the budget, and appropriated by Congress, had been shifted to accomplish other purposes. The Committee does not believe that TVA has tried to circumvent the Committee, but feels that funds included in the budget and justified for one purpose be used as contemplated by the Congress when acting on the appropriations bill. Therefore, in order to insure appropriate and proper oversite, the Committee directs not to exceed 10 percent of the funds appropriated for each program, project, or activity be transferred without prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations.

Columbia Dam, Tenn.—The Columbia Dam of the Upper Duck River project has been under construction for many years and consistently supported by the Committee. It is an integral part of the overall Upper Duck project which will enhance the water supply and other benefits of the entire project.

The Committee commends TVA for the progress made in the mussel conservation program and their cooperative work with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Continued close cooperation is encouraged so that when final approval of the conservation program is received from the Fish and Wildlife Service, TVA can complete project construction in an expeditious manner.

Once the conservation program is approved, the Committee directs the administration to forward a supplemental budget request to the Congress so the project can be completed as soon as possible.

Murphy Hill, Ala., Coal Gasification Plant.—The Committee is aware of TVA's efforts to identify equity participants in the Murphy Hill Coal Gasification Plant and that the likelihood of attracting additional partners is not good in view of current economic and other conditions.

Further, in April of this year, the Synthetic Fuels Corporation (SFC) again postponed consideration of the project.

Yet, the House Committee indicated in its report that "progress is being made in negotiations between the SFC and the consortium seeking to take over responsibility for financing, construction, and operating the plant."

However, the Committee feels that sufficient uncertainty remains regarding the future direction of the project. Therefore, the Committee cannot endorse continuation and directs TVA to undertake no further site activities until such time as the private sector consortium for financing, construction, and operation is finalized, and approval of the demonstration project by the Synthetic Fuels Corporation.

Further, the Committee expects TVA to make a final recommendation at the hearings on the 1985 budget regarding the continuation of the project.

The following table shows the allocation of the funds recommended for activities under this heading:

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	1983 allocation	1984 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
CAPITAL INVESTMENT				
Water resources:				
Columbia Dam and Reservoir	2,000			
New look at Pickwick Landing Dam	22,970	21,000	21,000	21,000
Additions and improvements	2,836	3,015	3,015	3,015
Land and forest resources:				
Recreation facilities	100	100	100	100
Land Between the Lakes	215	190	190	190
Economic resources:				
Yellow Creek Port	4,200			
Community resources:				
Local flood damage prevention facilities	700	610	610	610
National fertilizer development, chemical facilities:				
Curtain granulation unit	1,601			
Railroad tank car replacement	1,225	590	590	590
Suspension fertilizer unit	872	588	588	588
Water pollution control facilities	399	500	500	500
Fluid fertilizer storage facilities		1,500	1,500	1,500
Energy-efficient fertilizer process		1,100	1,100	1,100
Optimize ammonia plant		770	770	770
Replacements, improvements, and pollution abatement and support facilities	1,118	1,482	1,482	1,482
Ammonia-from-coal facilities	183	297	297	297
General services facilities	4,990	3,013	3,013	3,013
Subtotal, capital investment	43,409	34,755	34,755	34,755
EXPENSES				
Natural resources:				
Water resources	2,983	2,920	2,920	2,920
Reservoir system operations	18,495	19,490	19,490	19,490
Land and forest resources	3,978	4,059	4,059	4,059
Resource management and development support	2,619	2,541	2,541	2,541
Land Between the Lakes	6,235	6,705	6,705	6,705
Economic and community resources:				
Economic resources	8,850	8,160	11,610	8,160
Community resources	4,600	4,680	4,680	4,680
Agriculture resources development	4,950	3,955	3,955	3,955
National fertilizer development	26,672	28,615	28,615	28,615
Ammonia from coal	5,731	6,025	6,025	6,025
General services	640	595	595	595
Subtotal, expenses	85,753	87,745	91,195	87,745

RECOMMENDED APPROPRIATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	1983 allocation	1984 budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Unallocated reduction		−14,000		
Total program financed from appropriations	129,162	108,500	125,950	108,500
FINANCING				
Appropriations	176,433	61,229	78,679	61,229
Unobligated balance carried forward	−47,271	47,271	47,271	47,271
Total financing	129,162	[1] 108,500	[2,3] 125,950	[4] 122,500

[1] Of the total funding for fiscal year 1984 ($108,500,000), $47,271,000 shall be derived from funds appropriated in fiscal year 1983 and $61,229,000 in new appropriations requested in fiscal year 1984.

[2] Of the total funding for fiscal year 1984 ($125,950,000), $47,271,000 shall be derived from funds appropriated in fiscal year 1983 and $78,679,000 in new appropriations recommended by the House Appropriations Committee in fiscal year 1984.

[3] The following amendment applicable to fiscal year 1984 appropriations was added by the House Appropriations Committee:

> Sec. 507. Of the total budget authority provided in this Act, for payments not required by law and for purposes other than atomic energy defense activities, 3 per centum shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure: *Provided*, That of the amount provided in this Act for each appropriation account, activity, and project, for payments not required by law, the amount withheld shall not exceed 5 per centum.

[4] Of the total funding for fiscal year 1984 ($122,500,000), $47,271,000 shall be derived from funds appropriated in fiscal year 1983 and $75,229,000 in new appropriations requested in fiscal year 1984.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BILL

PREPARED PURSUANT TO SECTION 308(a), PUBLIC LAW 93-344

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority		Outlays	
	Committee allocation	Amount in bill	Committee allocation	Amount in bill
Comparison of amounts in the bill with the Committee allocation to its subcommittees of amounts in the First Concurrent Resolution for 1984: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development	N/A	14,171	N/A	[1] 14,649
Projections of outlays associated with budget authority recommended in the bill:				
1984				[2] 7,811
1985				4,700
1986				1,362
1987				174
1988 and future year				
Financial assistance to State and local governments for 1984 in the bill		125		10

[1] Includes outlays from prior-year budget authority, and from previously enacted and proposed legislation (including H.R. 3069).

[2] Excludes outlays from prior-year budget authority.

N/A: Not applicable.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983 AND THE BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984

[Becomes available automatically under earlier, or "permanent" law without further, or annual, action by the Congress. Thus, these amounts are not included in the accompanying bill.]

Agency and item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1983	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1984	Increase or decrease
PERMANENT NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY			
FEDERAL FUNDS			
Corps of Engineers—Civil: Permanent appropriations	$7,400,000	$7,700,000	+$300,000
Department of the Interior: Bureau of Reclamation: Miscellaneous appropriations	2,700,000	2,700,000	
Department of Energy: Payments to States under Federal Power Act	544,000	570,000	+26,000
Bonneville Power Administration Fund (authority to borrow)	205,500,000	324,500,000	+119,000,000
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund (authority to borrow)	989,558,000	808,242,000	-181,316,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, Federal funds	1,205,702,000	1,143,712,000	-61,990,000
TRUST FUNDS			
Rivers and harbors contributed funds	70,000,000	71,000,000	+1,000,000
Department of the Interior: Reclamation trust funds	13,800,000	27,675,000	+13,875,000
Department of Energy: Advances for cooperative work		24,000,000	+24,000,000
Appalachian Regional Commission: Miscellaneous trust fund accounts	4,900,000		-4,900,000
Total, permanent new budget (obligational) authority, trust funds	88,700,000	122,675,000	+33,975,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984

[Amounts in dollars]

Item (1)	1983 Appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recommendation (5)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −) 1983 Appropriation (6)	Budget estimate (7)	House allowance (8)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
Department of the Army							
Corps of Engineers - Civil							
General investigations	129,042,000	110,400,000	148,733,000	118,435,000	-10,607,000	+8,035,000	-30,298,000
Construction, general	1,506,405,000	820,700,000	892,829,000	885,779,000	-620,626,000	+65,079,000	-7,050,000
Flood control and coastal emergencies	29,877,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-19,877,000	---	---
Revolving Fund	---	---	9,500,000	---	---	---	-9,500,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO, & TN	403,052,000	290,000,000	310,330,000	297,960,000	-105,092,000	+7,960,000	-12,370,000
Operation and maintenance, general	1,187,667,000	1,161,300,000	1,215,032,000	1,170,620,000	-17,047,000	+9,320,000	-44,412,000
General expenses	96,000,000	103,000,000	103,000,000	103,000,000	+7,000,000	---	---
Special recreation use fees	4,942,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	+1,058,000	---	---
Total, title I, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of Defense - Civil	3,356,985,000	2,501,400,000	2,695,424,000	2,591,794,000	-765,191,000	+90,394,000	-103,630,000
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
Bureau of Reclamation							
General investigations	32,474,000	31,831,000	34,431,000	31,981,000	-493,000	+150,000	-2,450,000
Construction program	640,570,000	699,388,000	711,538,000	683,818,000	+43,248,000	-15,570,000	-27,720,000

Operation and maintenance	140,866,000	134,091,000	134,291,000	134,291,000	-6,575,000	+200,000	---
Loan program	55,106,000	41,500,000	52,970,000	40,500,000	-14,606,000	-1,000,000	-12,470,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(26,922,000)	(40,332,000)	(51,802,000)	(43,332,000)	(+16,410,000)	(+3,000,000)	(-8,470,000)
General administrative expenses	39,928,000	53,400,000	53,750,000	53,400,000	+13,472,000	---	-350,000
Emergency Fund	1,919,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-919,000	---	---
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	910,863,000	961,210,000	987,980,000	944,990,000	+34,127,000	-16,220,000	-42,990,000
Total, title II, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of the Interior	910,863,000	961,210,000	987,980,000	944,990,000	+34,127,000	-16,220,000	-42,990,000
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY							
Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,897,096,000	1,855,960,000	1,713,112,000	1,720,444,000	-176,652,000	-135,516,000	+7,332,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	352,976,000	243,665,000	251,097,000	233,265,000	-119,711,000	-10,400,000	-17,832,000
General reduction	---	---	---	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
Subtotal	2,250,072,000	2,099,625,000	1,964,209,000	1,943,709,000	-306,363,000	-155,916,000	-20,500,000
Uranium Enrichment Activities:							
Operating Expenses	1,232,036,000	1,570,600,000	1,576,600,000	1,616,600,000	+384,564,000	+46,000,000	+40,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	710,100,000	669,400,000	658,400,000	638,400,000	-71,700,000	-31,000,000	-20,000,000
General reduction	---	---	---	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000
Subtotal	1,942,136,000	2,240,000,000	2,235,000,000	2,235,000,000	+292,864,000	-5,000,000	---
Gross revenues	-1,968,319,000	-2,240,000,000	-2,235,000,000	-2,235,000,000	-266,681,000	+5,000,000	---
Net appropriation	-26,183,000	---	---	---	+26,183,000	---	---
General Science and Research Activities:							
Operating Expenses	411,853,000	479,750,000	481,750,000	472,750,000	+60,897,000	-7,000,000	-9,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	123,316,000	165,500,000	161,500,000	172,500,000	+49,184,000	+7,000,000	+11,000,000
General reduction	---	---	---	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
Subtotal	535,169,000	645,250,000	643,250,000	635,250,000	+100,081,000	-10,000,000	-8,000,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item (1)	1983 Appropriation (2)	Budget estimate (3)	House allowance (4)	Committee recommendation (5)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −): 1983 Appropriation (6)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −): Budget estimate (7)	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −): House allowance (8)
Nuclear waste disposal fund	217,325,000	306,675,000	306,675,000	306,675,000	+89,350,000	---	---
Atomic Energy Defense Activites:							
Operating Expenses	4,375,700,000	5,215,125,000	5,084,325,000	5,098,925,000	+723,225,000	-116,200,000	+14,600,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	1,328,000,000	1,610,450,000	1,474,050,000	1,401,950,000	+73,950,000	-208,500,000	-72,100,000
Subtotal	5,703,700,000	6,825,575,000	6,558,375,000	6,500,875,000	+797,175,000	-324,700,000	-57,500,000
Departmental administration:							
Operating Expenses	381,482,000	346,510,000	366,075,000	356,075,000	-25,407,000	+9,565,000	-10,000,000
Plant and Capital Equipment	15,593,000	4,981,000	4,981,000	4,981,000	-10,612,000	---	---
Subtotal	397,075,000	351,491,000	371,056,000	361,056,000	-36,019,000	+9,565,000	-10,000,000
Miscellaneous revenues	-175,541,000	-209,619,000	-209,619,000	-209,619,000	-34,078,000	---	---
Net appropriation	221,534,000	141,872,000	161,437,000	151,437,000	-70,097,000	+9,565,000	-10,000,000
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS							
Alaska Power Administration, operation and maintenance	3,945,000	3,210,000	3,410,000	3,410,000	-535,000	+200,000	---
Bonneville Power Administration Fund							
Borrowing Authority	249,500,000	203,500,000	123,400,000	123,400,000	-126,100,000	-80,100,000	---
(Limitation on direct loans)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	---	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	---	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	---	---

Southeastern Power Administration, operation and maintenance	3,964,000	20,594,000	20,594,000	20,594,000	+16,630,000	---	---
Southwestern Power Administration, operation and maintenance	20,756,000	36,229,000	36,229,000	36,229,000	+15,473,000	---	---
Western Area Power Administration, construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance	149,750,000	219,630,000	184,630,000	204,630,000	+54,880,000	-15,000,000	+20,000,000
Western Area Power Administration, emerency fund	337,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	+163,000	---	---
Subtotal	428,252,000	483,663,000	368,763,000	388,763,000	-39,489,000	-94,900,000	+20,000,000
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	86,139,000	94,582,000	89,582,000	94,582,000	+8,443,000	---	+5,000,000
Revenues Applied	---	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000	---	---
Subtotal	86,139,000	34,582,000	29,582,000	34,582,000	-51,557,000	---	+5,000,000
GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT FUND							
Geothermal loan guarantee and interest assistance program	---	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	+2,100,000	---	---
Total, title III, new budget (obligational) authority, Department of Energy	9,416,008,000	10,539,342,000	10,034,391,000	9,963,391,000	+547,383,000	-575,951,000	-71,000,000
Operating Expenses	(6,886,023,000)	(7,845,346,000)	(7,484,363,000)	(7,512,295,000)	(+626,272,000)	(-333,051,000)	(+27,932,000)
Plant and Capital Equipment	(2,529,985,000)	(2,693,996,000)	(2,550,028,000)	(2,451,096,000)	(-78,889,000)	(-242,900,000)	(-98,932,000)
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES							
Appalachian Regional Commission: Salaries and Expenses	2,900,000	---	2,500,000	2,700,000	-200,000	+2,700,000	+200,000
Funds Appropriated to the President: Appalachian regional development programs 1/	165,133,000	80,000,000	150,000,000	125,000,000	-40,133,000	+45,000,000	-25,000,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1983 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984—Continued

[Amounts in dollars]

Item	1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Senate committee recommendation compared with (+ or −)		
					1983 Appropriation	Budget estimate	House allowance
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Delaware River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	241,000	191,000	191,000	191,000	-50,000	---	---
Contribution to Delaware River Basin Commission	269,000	269,000	269,000	269,000	---	---	---
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	510,000	460,000	460,000	460,000	-50,000	---	---
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin:							
Contribution to Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin	55,000	---	68,000	68,000	+13,000	+68,000	---
Nuclear Regulatory Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	462,504,000	466,800,000	465,800,000	466,800,000	+4,296,000	---	+1,000,000
Susquehanna River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	---	---	191,000	191,000	+191,000	+191,000	---
Contribution to Susquehanna River Basin Commission	217,000	230,000	230,000	230,000	+13,000	---	---
Total, Susquehanna River Basin Commission	217,000	230,000	421,000	421,000	+204,000	+191,000	---
Tennessee Valley Authority:							
Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority Fund	216,433,000	61,229,000	78,679,000	75,229,000	-141,204,000	+14,000,000	-3,450,000

Water Resources Council:							
Water resources planning	4,083,000	---	---	---	-4,083,000	---	---
Total, title IV, new budget (obligational) authority, independent agencies	851,835,000	608,719,000	697,928,000	670,678,000	-181,157,000	+61,959,000	-27,250,000

TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 507 General Reduction	---	---	-235,720,000	---	---	---	+235,720,000
Grand total:							
New budget (obligational) authority	14,535,691,000	14,610,671,000	14,180,003,000	14,170,853,000	-364,838,000	-439,818,000	-9,150,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(66,922,000)	(80,332,000)	(91,802,000)	(83,332,000)	(+16,410,000)	(+3,000,000)	(-8,470,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	---	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	---	---

1/ FY 1984 estimate proposed in the Budget for later transmittal.